

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Harry W. Hultgren, Jr., of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Connecticut for the term of 4 years, vice Simon S. Cohen, resigned.

Robert S. Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years, vice B. Hayden Crawford, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Edwin W. Rawlings, 95A, (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code.

Lt. Gen. Samuel E. Anderson, 92A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 16, 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the countries indicated:

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, to Cuba.

Philip K. Crowe, of Maryland, to the Union of South Africa.

Sheldon T. Mills, of Oregon, to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

William C. Trimble, of Maryland, to the Kingdom of Cambodia.

Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the country indicated:

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Father John Kidykas, S.J., Lithuanian Jesuit Fathers' House, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, Father of infinite love, Father of all wisdom and orderliness, Father of all life and happiness, I humbly pray Thee to bless this House of Representatives, charged by Thee and by the people with the promotion of order, peace, and happiness. May this blessing of Thine include a large share of Thy divine wisdom, of Thy merciful justice, and of Thy just love, which alone can enable them to cooperate with Thee in promoting Thy kingdom of truth and life, Thy kingdom of sanctity and grace, Thy kingdom of justice, love, and peace, and so to insure our Nation's true and lasting welfare.

And since Thou didst command us to love also our neighbor, so, Father of all oppressed and suffering, I entreat Thee to move the hearts and wills of each one here present to search and to find ways and means for bringing freedom and lib-

erty to nations and peoples oppressed by a ruthless enemy of all that is holy, truly human and just, and which is constantly threatening the remaining free nations with subversion and subjugation.

In behalf of those doomed, as it seems, to perish in that godless slavery, today I recommend to Thy mercy in a special way, and to the sympathetic help of this noble body the people of Lithuania. Grant O Lord, that this Congress may never abandon that small nation to extinction by Thine own bitter enemies, but rather that it may prove to be the good Samaritan, protecting the natural rights to life, liberty, and happiness, even of the weakest of nations, so that, restored to its freedom, the Lithuanian people may again join the family of free nations as grateful witness of Thy merciful help and powerful victory over the forces of evil, and to rejoice in Thy glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 12, 1959, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 13, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 712(a)(2) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 I have appointed the following members of the Banking and Currency Committee to be members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production: Hon. PAUL BROWN, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Hon. ALBERT RAINS, Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH, Hon. EDGAR W. HESTAND.

With kind regards, I am,
Very sincerely,

BRENT SPENCE.

GROUND BREAKING FOR EXTENSION OF THE EAST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce to the Members, so that they will be on notice, that the ground breaking for the extension of the east front of the Capitol will take place on Monday, February 23, at 11 o'clock a.m.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from a committee:

JANUARY 21, 1959.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Having become the ranking majority member of the Committee on Armed Services I find that I do not have adequate time to devote to that position and continue to serve on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Therefore, I hereby resign as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve on that most important committee.

Sincerely,

PAUL J. KILDAY,
Member of Congress.

Without objection the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, United States Code, section 2251, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during whatever general debate may be carried on in the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, February 23, 1959, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LITHUANIA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, while commemorating the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence to the Republic of Lithuania after World War I, it appears fitting to keep in mind the circumstances in which Lithuania lost its independence and became one of the colonies of the Soviet empire.

It seems also particularly fitting to review briefly Soviet Russia's action in the case of Lithuania at the time when pressure is developing for negotiating with Soviet Russia new agreements and new treaties regarding Germany.

The story of the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union is a story of broken treaties, broken agreements, and

brazen disregard for international rules of conduct.

I wonder how much value and how much significance could our leaders attach to whatever agreements or arrangements Soviet Russia subscribes to, in view of that country's conduct with regard to Lithuania and her two similarly small sister Republics, Estonia and Latvia.

Soviet Russia solemnly agreed in 1920 to respect the independence of the three Baltic Republics in duly signed peace treaties. Soviet Russia signed those treaties with each of the three countries located on its northwestern borders recognizing the three new sovereignties and subsequently entering voluntarily with each of them into contractual agreements under which diplomatic, consular, and trade relationship were duly established.

In 1928, at the initiative of Soviet Russia, there was signed in Moscow a special agreement, the so-called Litvinov protocol, providing for the immediate entry into force of the so-called Kellogg Pact, signed in Paris on August 27, 1928. Soviet Russia and all of her neighbors agreed to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and proceeded—again at Mr. Litvinov's initiative—to negotiate an elaborate series of nonaggression treaties again providing for the inviolability of all borders separating Soviet Russia from its neighbors. Those treaties were signed by Soviet Russia in 1932.

The carefully prepared and solemnly established structure of collective security agreements, duly signed and ratified, did not for one moment stop Soviet Russia from requesting, in 1940, the stationing of Soviet troops in Lithuania, in Latvia and in Estonia. Objections and protests of the three small Baltic countries were met with a show of force and with a direct threat to use it. The three independent countries had to surrender and Soviet troops erased the inviolate borders. In July 1940, Soviet occupation of the three countries and the annexation was completed.

I am proud to say that this at least is one of the numerous Soviet annexations of foreign territory which the United States has not recognized, and that we still have here in Washington the three diplomatic missions representing free Lithuania, free Estonia and free Latvia.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the memory of the flagrant disregard for international contractual agreements shown by Soviet Russia in the case of the three Baltic Republics, will remain in the minds of our diplomats who intended to sit down with their Soviet colleagues to negotiate more treaties and more agreements which as far as Soviet Russia is concerned will—I am sure—be again relegated to the Kremlin's wastebasket whenever it suits the purposes of the Kremlin's masters to do so.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in solemn observance of Lithuania's independence day, the 41st anniversary of the day when her people rose from the destruction of the First World War to proclaim an independent republic.

Those who are students of the proud history of Lithuania remind us that since the 13th century she has a record of identity as a sovereign state, that her people have resisted all efforts to force them into a cultural and political mold that is foreign to them.

Invaded, fought over, conquered by brute force and larger numbers on many occasions, they nevertheless have always kept alive the memory of freedom.

They seized their chance for independence again when the czar's armies disintegrated, and on February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their Republic. It was not their good fortune to be given many years of freedom. They became a pawn in 1939 of the grim struggle between the Nazi and Soviet empires; they were fought over in the savage years that followed; they have not yet been able to reestablish their independent government. But in little more than a decade, they had established their right to freedom.

The first land-reform law of modern Europe was a Lithuanian law. An education program was launched which reduced illiteracy to 15 percent after generations of foreign rule had left two-thirds of the people unable to read and write.

It is not possible for the Lithuanians on their farms and in their cities to celebrate this anniversary day, for the Soviet system has got them by the throat. But it is with good cause that our State Department has refused, all through these years, to recognize as legal and right the Kremlin's claim that Lithuania has been swallowed up and extinguished, incorporated in the vast Communist empire.

Nations do not die merely because some other nation decimates or drives out their leaders and puts quislings and puppets in their stead.

The love of freedom is powerful and enduring, the spark of liberty is not easily put out. Wherever the children of the Lithuanian people dwell today, they have the right to work in all proper ways toward the end of independence for the land of their fathers. It is proper for us to recognize the day of commemoration they celebrate.

BUILDING OF STEAM TURBINE GENERATORS BY FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1959, I wrote a letter to the

Director of the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization regarding the national security problems of heavy electrical equipment imports and placed a copy of my letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now there is a new problem of grave concern to the country and to the people of the congressional district I represent.

A pennywise but pound-foolish action by our Government has in one move weakened the defense potential of this Nation and jeopardized the jobs of at least 700 skilled American workmen.

I refer to the recent decision of the Tennessee Valley Authority to purchase a giant steam turbine generator for installation on the TVA system. This generator—the biggest yet built for use in the United States—will be manufactured, not by an American company but by an English manufacturer, the C. A. Parsons Co. Thus, the largest single unit in the vital TVA power system will be dependent for repair and maintenance on a factory across the Atlantic Ocean, which in time of war could be completely cut off and unable to do the job.

And why have we been forced to turn to a foreign company for such a key unit in our Nation's power system? The answer is, of course, that we were not forced at all. We chose to do so because we could get a cut-rate price—a price made possible by the low wages paid in England. English wages, on the average, are only about one-third—recent comparisons indicate 37 percent—as high as American average wage rates. The American manufacturers, of course, observe minimum-wage laws and other legislation which benefit the American workman, but foreign bidders are exempted from such regulations.

So how does Uncle Sam handle this situation? He blithely pits the American companies against the foreign companies in a ruthless price competition and gives the order to a foreign firm. Meanwhile in cities like Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Schenectady, and Milwaukee, skilled American workmen are laid off in sizable numbers in the heavy electrical apparatus plants of Westinghouse, General Electric, and Allis-Chalmers. In these labor depressed areas, men with as much as 17 years' service and seniority will be affected by this latest TVA foreign purchase.

The low U.S. bidder in this instance, after TVA evaluated the base bids, was the Westinghouse Electric Corp. which manufactures generators in East Pittsburgh and steam turbines in Lester, which is near Philadelphia.

I note that my friend from New York, Mr. Stratton, stated yesterday that the General Electric Co. was the low American bidder on this turbogenerator. According to the TVA office in Washington, Westinghouse Electric Corp. was the American company whose bid was the lowest when evaluated in terms of the TVA specifications. This means that Westinghouse would have been awarded this TVA contract if it had not been awarded to the British company.

The loss of this big order for the half-million kilowatt TVA steam turbine generator means 1,080,000 man-hours of

work lost to Westinghouse workmen. It means another 375,000 man-hours of work lost to the employees of Westinghouse suppliers. Altogether it means the loss of 1 year's work for 700 workmen. All because our Government pretends that American companies like Westinghouse, General Electric, Allis-Chalmers, and others ought to be able to compete on a nearly equal basis pricewise with foreign companies who pay their workers only about one-third as much.

American companies obviously cannot compete against low foreign prices on heavy, custom-built electric power equipment which contains such high labor content. Steam turbine generators are very big and complex machines, each one somewhat different from the next. A great deal of manual labor is involved in their construction. There is no assembly line possible in this business to help reduce the foreign wage differential. Unless our Government considers more than the selling price, American companies will never get another order for power generators from our own Government.

Even if our Government chooses to disregard the security and welfare of its laboring citizens, the national security cannot be disregarded. For some time, the Government has been buying more and more electrical equipment abroad to take advantage of the cheap prices. But now, for the first time, the United States has bought a steam turbine generator abroad. The steam turbine generator is the prime mover in any electric power system. It is the source of the electricity—the heart of our modern production system. Our biggest steam turbine generator is being procured abroad. What does this mean in terms of our national security? It means we are putting our biggest eggs in a very weak basket.

Power generators are not quickly repairable or replaceable. Their maintenance requires ready access to the plants of the manufacturer and the technical help of his engineers. The Parsons company has three technical men in all of North America and depends on parts and other replacement items from England—which could be cut off from ocean transportation in time of war. On the other hand, a firm like Westinghouse has more than 1,000 field service engineers on its technical staff and its manufacturing plants are close by. Which company would you like to depend on to keep your power system running in a national emergency?

Furthermore, Westinghouse and the other American manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment have been the leaders in research and development of this power apparatus. Parsons is facing the job of designing and building a 500,000-kilowatt turbine generator and the biggest unit they ever built before is 120,000 kilowatts. Westinghouse, on the other hand, is now building a 325,000-kilowatt unit and has experience in the temperatures and pressures which the new TVA unit will require.

What do you suppose the British would do in the same situation? We do not have to guess—we know. They would

refuse to buy from a foreign company. The Central Electricity Authority of Great Britain is the agency that buys practically all of Britain's heavy electric power apparatus. And that agency does not buy power generators from foreign firms as a matter of policy. They have said they consider it unwise for their electricity supply industry to be dependent upon foreign manufacturers for spares and maintenance. And they are absolutely right. In fact, none of the nations which manufacture heavy power equipment consider it wise to equip their own power systems with foreign-made machines for the same good reason. So why is it heresy for the United States to follow the same sound reasoning? How can it even be good for our Government foreign policy if it is not good for America?

This whole matter is coming up for another decision shortly, I understand, when the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization acts on a petition supported by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association. This petition calls for restricting the import of just four specific types of key heavy power apparatus by our Government. This would not apply to most of the electrical industry's production—just four products in the heavy power apparatus category. It is high time such action be taken. Our national security is involved and this action could stop a trend of foreign procurement that threatens to ultimately put the Nation's electric power system at the mercy of foreign lands.

Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 12, I sent telegrams to President Eisenhower, to General Vogel, Chairman of the TVA Board, and to Mr. Leo Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization, protesting the TVA decision to award this large steam turbine generator to a foreign concern. Also, I received a telegram from local 601 of the IUE-AFL-CIO protesting this action by TVA and the administration. I am placing in the RECORD at this point copies of all of these telegrams:

FEBRUARY 12, 1959.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I have protested to the Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority and to the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization regarding a recent announcement that the Tennessee Valley Authority has awarded a contract to Parsons Electric Co., Ltd., a British manufacturer, for a very large steam turbine electric generator.

I believe such an award to a foreign company violates the national security interests of the United States, and that it represents Government procurement policy which is difficult to comprehend in view of the serious unemployment which exists in Pennsylvania and other States where American manufacturers of heavy electric equipment are located.

I respectfully urge that you promptly revise the policies of your administration which permit the awarding of a contract to very low paid British employees while American workers are so badly in need of work.

Respectfully,

CONGRESSMAN ELMER J. HOLLAND,
30th District, Pennsylvania.

FEBRUARY 12, 1959.

The Honorable HERBERT D. VOGEL,
Chairman of the Board,
Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.:

Have just learned you have awarded a contract to Parsons Electric Co., Ltd., a British company, for the manufacture of a 500,000 kilowatt steam turbine generator, and that the low evaluated domestic bidder was Westinghouse Electric Corp.

I urgently request that TVA reconsider this action in order not to deprive Pennsylvania workers of nearly 700 man-years of employment.

Furthermore, I regard the award of this contract to a foreign firm by an agency of the United States, which is financed by public funds, as a serious violation of sound public policy.

I also believe the procurement of such a machine from a foreign country is violative of the national security interests of the United States.

I urge that the award to the British concern be canceled and given to the low evaluated American bidder.

Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND,
30th District, Pennsylvania.

FEBRUARY 12, 1959.

The Honorable LEO A. HOEGH,
Director, Office of Civil and Defense
Mobilization, Washington, D.C.:

Have just learned that Tennessee Valley Authority has awarded contract to Parsons Electric Co., Ltd., a British manufacturer, for a 500,000 kilowatt steam turbine generator for installation in the TVA electric system.

I believe that the addition of this foreign-made generating equipment to your system, which already has a heavy concentration of foreign-made electrical equipment in it, is to jeopardize the national security interests of the United States.

I urge that you promptly advise the Tennessee Valley Authority that this steam turbine generator should be manufactured by an American concern because of the jeopardy to TVA power facilities and because of the importance of maintaining a healthy American electrical manufacturing industry.

While this steam turbine machine is not included in the pending electrical industry petitions which are pending before you, it involves the same serious national security principles, and I trust that you will promptly render a ruling on the pending petitions to provide adequate protection to the national security interests of this country, and that you will include such a ruling with respect to steam turbine generators even though the latter are not a part of this petition.

Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND,
30th District, Pennsylvania.

PITTSBURGH, Pa., February 12, 1959.

HON. ELMER HOLLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We understand that a contract for a large steam turbine generator has been given to the G. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England, rather than to Westinghouse, which was the lowest American bidder. This order would have given thousands of man-hours of work to our members here at East Pittsburgh, where more than 3,000 are now unemployed and living off unemployment compensation. Many of these have 17 years of service. Our members who are still employed are sharing time and drawing half wages. If it our Government's policy to create employment in other countries at the expense of our own welfare, then something must be done. We find it difficult to satisfactorily explain to the unemployed members of our union that our Government has seen fit to contract their type of work to people in other countries. We would appreciate knowing your

position on this vital matter that, in effect, means food on the table for our members. It is regrettable that we find ourselves calling this matter to your attention, for up to now we have assumed that our respected and responsible Government officials would be looking after the best interests of American workmen who are also, after all, both voters and taxpayers—although, at present, it seems that this is completely forgotten. We demand that an immediate investigation be made of this shortsighted policy and that corrective measures be taken immediately to alleviate what has developed into critical unemployment conditions in our area.

PAUL CARMICHAEL,
President,

TOM SULLIVAN,
Business Agent,
JAMES FERACE,

Chief Steward, Local 601, IUE-AFL-CIO.

PITTSBURGH, PA., February 12, 1959.

HON. ELMER HOLLAND,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.:

Resolution sent by wire this date our membership of 5,500 Westinghouse Electric salaried employees respectfully urge your influence in proposing congressional investigation into policies of TVA. While thousands of Westinghouse workers remain idle in a labor-surplus area TVA awards a multimillion dollar turbogenerator contract to a foreign competitor, while Westinghouse was the lowest domestic bidder. This contract would have provided 700 Westinghouse employees approximately 2 years of work. This policy not only affects business and economy of the Nation, it results in loss of tax income for the Government and could endanger the security of our country.

THOMAS E. O'LEARY,
President, Association of Westinghouse Salaried Employees.

Mr. PAUL CARMICHAEL, President,
Mr. TOM SULLIVAN, Business Agent,
JAMES FERACE, Chief Steward,
Local 601, IUE-AFL-CIO,
East Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Retel have protested to the President of the United States, the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization the award of this contract instead of to Westinghouse.

Am mailing you copies of my telegrams.
CONGRESSMAN ELMER J. HOLLAND.

A WORD OF PRAISE FOR THE ARMY ENGINEERS

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, in the short time it has been my privilege to serve in this body, I have noticed that our Members more often rise to complain than to compliment. As a matter of fact on January 29 this year in a report on the flood disaster in my district involving a break in the dike of the Kokosing River at Mount Vernon, Ohio, I took the U.S. Army Engineers to task for delays on a survey report of the project which had been pending for years.

I pointed out then that unless immediate action was taken to repair the

dike, the people of Mount Vernon might very well suffer a devastating recurrence of the January 21 disaster. My colleagues, I am extremely happy to stand before you today to tell you that the Army Engineers responded to the needs of our people promptly—cut red tape—set to work without delay to provide the necessary dike repairs. You will understand why I am so pleased to commend the engineers today when I tell you that their ready response to the crisis created by the flood of January 21 in fact played a major part in averting another catastrophe in Mount Vernon when floods struck Ohio again on February 10. As a tribute to the engineers, I quote from a headline story in the Mount Vernon News for February 11, 1959, entitled "Newly Repaired Dike Saves City."

But while the crest was lower, the west side of Mount Vernon was saved from another disastrous flooding only because of the fast work done by the city and Federal Governments in getting dike repairs started after the breaches made January 21.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to further report that our Army Engineers are, in addition to the Kokosing project, currently considering emergency repairs to the levee on nearby Dry Creek, also in Mount Vernon. Here is what the Mount Vernon News said about Dry Creek on February 11:

In Mount Vernon, yesterday's floodwaters from Dry Creek got onto Main Street at Newark Road, but were held back by sandbag barriers. Homes were flooded in the Memorial Park area and on Columbus Road, but there was no water in the business section.

Further in connection with Dry Creek in Mount Vernon, I quote from a statement from Mr. Harry S. Wright, chairman of the Knox County Board of Commissioners, dated February 12, 1959:

We listened yesterday to telephone calls one after the other from mothers, fathers and merchants, pleading that we do something to relieve this situation from recurring in the future along the levee between Dry Creek and the Columbus Road.

Mr. Speaker, as in the case of the Kokosing breakthrough, I have every reason to believe that the Army Engineers will, in accordance with our request, proceed promptly to do what needs to be done to repair the levee on Dry Creek so that our homeowners may sleep at night with a feeling of freedom from destruction.

And, too, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Engineers and all other agencies of government will be as equally understanding and helpful as we project our plans into the future with a view to permanent control of floodwaters to the cities of Newark, Fredericktown, and other areas throughout the 17th Congressional District.

THE 10-PERCENT FEDERAL TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS SHOULD BE REPEALED

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, I introduced H.R. 1364, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 to repeal the tax presently imposed on the transportation of persons.

During the 85th Congress, the 3-percent excise tax on the transportation of property was repealed but unfortunately its counterpart, the 10-percent tax on travelers, was retained.

All of us are familiar, I am sure, with the original purposes of this tax which was imposed in 1941 as a temporary measure to help fill revenue needs and to discourage the general public's use of the airlines, railroads, and buses during World War II. Despite the fact that the reasons for imposing this tax have disappeared, it is unfortunately still with us. We must rid ourselves of it now.

If we ever lose the ability to move quickly and safely from one place to another, either in this country or throughout the world, we as a nation will be as impotent as you and I would be if we lose our ability to walk or talk. There is no doubt about our transportation industry's essentiality and importance to the economy of the country. The general public needs adequate and modern travel facilities. Our transportation system must continue to move forward and expand not only to prepare for the predicted 60 million increase in our population by 1975 but in fact even to exist in this age of electronics and atomic energy. No deterrent should be allowed to stand in the way which might discourage the general public from using common carriers to the limit of their capacity. The 10 percent tax on travel is just such a deterrent and should be repealed as quickly as possible.

By discouraging travel on commercial carriers, the tax places a heavy burden upon one of the Nation's most vital industries. The American transportation system is the envy of the world. During the Korean conflict and World War II, it performed a tremendous job of speedily and efficiently transporting essential personnel and material. If another national emergency should develop, the industry would again be asked to perform miracles of transportation while the automobile would again be curtailed as a luxury this Nation couldn't afford. Public carriers must be prepared.

To be ready for a national emergency requires the most efficient use of our economic resources. One of the most important ways to accomplish this is to fully utilize and properly maintain our commercial transportation system. The existence of such a system in periods of limited resources depends upon its being permitted to use its facilities economically in periods of abundant resources, a fact too often overlooked. We should therefore encourage the growth of a sound and healthy common carrier system rather than discourage, by tax, the use of such industry's facilities on the part of the traveling public.

Here is a tax that no one has testified is good, fair, or beneficial. It is equally disliked by all regulated carriers and the traveling public. Members of Congress, executives of our airlines, railroads, intercity buslines and shipping companies, trade association officials and the man of the street have all appeared at one time or another before congressional committees urging its repeal. I cannot understand why, if the income derived from the tax amounts to about \$200 million a year, Congress refuses to repeal it, particularly when many economists have stated that it is very probable that the Government stands to collect more revenue through increased use of our public carriers.

And do we realize that the effect of this tax on passengers adds to today's already high cost of living. Let me show you how. Since one-third of passenger transportation, it has been conservatively estimated, is for necessary business travel, the taxes on transportation will be included in operating expenses of the companies incurring them and passed on, at least partially, in the pricing of their products. The cost of collecting the tax is borne by the carriers and is included in operating expenses and thus affects the level of fares. And finally inadequate passenger revenues in the case of the railroads must be recovered from freight transportation by increases in rates. So here we have a tax which is not only unnecessary but also inflationary.

Another objectionable feature of the tax is that its burden is greater on the low-income families which spend most if not all of their income on the necessities of life. This group, consisting of about one-third of the families in the United States, it has been estimated, have no other means of travel than our common carriers. For them travel is not a luxury but a necessity and the travel tax which is collected by common carriers competes with the food and clothing dollar.

Not only does this 10 percent tax discriminate against the low income families but because it was imposed as a penalty surcharge, only on travel furnished by for-hire carriers, the tax is inherently discriminatory. As originally enacted, the tax applied to all amounts paid within the United States for transportation by rail, motor vehicle, water or air. This was not unfair in the beginning because there was no discrimination between competing carriers although it did give an advantage to the automobiles which, however, during the war was practically nonexistent. If, as expected, the tax had been repealed at the end of World War II, the inherent discrimination of the tax could not have developed fully. Instead, gas rationing, the device used to discourage private travel, was terminated and the travel tax was and is still being continued.

To make the tax further discriminatory, Congress has amended the law on several occasions so that today only travel within the continental United States and a 225-mile buffer zone is subjected to the tax. International travel is thus encouraged at the expense of domestic travel. Millions of dollars have been spent on our national parks

for the benefit of Americans, and they, with our foreign guests, must pay a penalty to visit these places by train, airline, or bus. This is a curious and unhealthy situation.

The effect of the tax in discouraging travel in the United States by commercial means is very visibly demonstrated by the change in the character of intercity travel between 1946, the first full postwar year, and 1958. In 1946 common carriers transported 27 percent of all intercity travelers. Today this figure has dropped to slightly more than 10 percent in spite of the fact that total intercity miles have almost doubled during the 12-year period. How are people getting from city to city? Almost 90 percent of them are traveling with their families in the automobile which is not subjected to the travel tax.

This drop in intercity mileage which our large common carriers have experienced is extremely detrimental to the future of our transportation industry. With the airlines trying valiantly to find the money to order new jet airplanes, with the railroads' passenger car fleet totally inadequate for an emergency according to the Department of the Army, and with revenue of the bus companies—about 80 percent of which are small business—inadequate to cope with rising costs, why does the Congress of the United States, by refusing to repeal the travel tax, not recognize that it is fostering unsound economic conditions in the transportation industry and inadequacy of the transportation plant to meet the needs of commerce and national defense? The travel tax is in derogation of the national transportation policy which is spelled out in the Interstate Commerce Act. How much longer can we go on talking out of both sides of our mouths at once? Let us let our right hand act in concert with our left. Let us keep our transportation system second to none—one that is ready at all times for anything that might come. Let us repeal immediately the 10 percent tax on the transportation of persons.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanians are one of the old nationality groups which have had a long and glorious history. At the end of the 18th century they lost their national independence to the Russian czarist regime, but on February 16, 1918—41 years ago today—they again regained their freedom and proclaimed their independence.

The Lithuanians enjoyed their independence for 22 years and lived in peace and happiness. They rebuilt their little country on the Baltic Sea and created a truly democratic way of life in their homeland. But after the outbreak of World War II, tiny Lithuania was

quickly occupied by the Soviet Union. Harsh and brutal measures were imposed upon it and the defenseless little country soon was incorporated into the imperialistic giant from the east.

Since those sad days Lithuanian independence has continued to live in the hearts and minds of liberty-loving and patriotic Lithuanians and all their many friends. We in the free world salute these inspiring sentiments and pledge our efforts to support the cause of freedom and liberty in all the world.

LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia became independent nations just 41 years ago today, and enjoyed two decades of freedom and progress. During these years a number of agreements were signed with the Soviet Union which were supposed to guarantee the sovereignty and integrity of these three Baltic States. However, in 1939 a "mutual assistance" pact was signed—under duress by the three states—which resulted in the stationing of Soviet forces in these countries. In June of 1940 the Soviets demanded that the Baltic States reorganize their governments, and that governments more friendly to the Soviet be established.

The Baltic States had little choice but to comply and new governments were formed. At that time the Soviet Union commenced military occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. This was the end of freedom and self-government. Rigged elections were staged for the legislatures of the Baltic States and in July, 1940, the States were incorporated into the Soviet Union as Soviet Socialist Republics.

The United States, in 1940, refused to recognize the action of the Soviet Union in forcibly incorporating these free nations into their Union. Today, we still maintain this position and recognize in this country the diplomatic representatives of the last free governments of the Baltic States. The United States continues to believe that the peoples of these countries have the right to determine their own political, economic, and cultural systems, and the U.S. Government is confident that the determination, industry, and love of freedom of the peoples of the Baltic States will make it possible for them to regain the freedom and independence of which they were so unjustly deprived.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on this 41st anniversary of Lithuania's independence it is fitting that this House pause in its proceedings to honor a people dedicated to freedom and liberty. Nearly 19 years have passed since Soviet forces ruthlessly swept over her borders and forcibly sealed Lithuania behind the Iron Curtain. Yet we can be certain that the Communists have not been able to snuff out the love of freedom that burns deeply within the hearts of all Lithuanians.

The tragic plight of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States is a source of concern to all freedom-loving peoples around the world. While we cannot know fully the nature of the indignities and inhumanities their inhabitants have been forced to undergo, we realize their sufferings are great. So long as the Soviet Union continues to hold these states in subjection, their people will be deprived of the precious liberties they once knew.

On February 16, 1918, the State of Lithuania became an independent democratic Republic. Her people were accorded the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and assembly; freedom of religion was guaranteed; land reforms were instituted and industrial expansion undertaken. For 22 years the Republic of Lithuania took its rightful place in the family of free nations and made marked contributions to the culture of Europe. During this time the Lithuanian people demonstrated that democracy was both possible and practical in a small country.

In June 1940, the Soviet Union cruelly seized Lithuania and proceeded to incorporate her territory into the U.S.S.R. This action was quickly denounced by the U.S. Government which has consistently refused to recognize any such forcible annexation. We believe that the people of Lithuania have an inherent right to choose their own political, economic, and cultural systems.

On this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am happy to join with my colleagues and the million Americans of Lithuanian descent in paying tribute to a brave and courageous people. Their resolute faith in Almighty God and their great love of liberty has not wavered, even in the face of Communist tyrannies. With them we pray that the day will not be far distant when they will again know and experience the priceless joys of a free society.

GOVERNMENT BUYING OF FOREIGN-MADE ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include pertinent material in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the recent decisions concerning Government buying of foreign made electrical equipment

may be the straw that will break the camel's back.

For years a small minority have been fighting reciprocal trades, foreign aid, and so forth. I have not always been a member of this group. However, the latest development in this field is adding recruits by the thousands.

There can be no legitimate excuse for such action as that which gave England and Switzerland millions of dollars worth of orders for Government work.

I for one will not go along with this policy if it means the loss of American jobs or American prosperity.

Following are telegrams received and sent by me further explaining our situation:

FEBRUARY 4, 1959.

Mr. DAVID HILL,
Administrator, REA, Washington, D.C.:

Pursuant to my telephone conversation, I herewith officially and vigorously protest the awarding turbine generator contract the Medina Electric Corp. to Switzerland. The Elliott Co. in Jeannette, Pa., seriously affected by this decision. Entire community considered serious labor surplus area and every man-hour payroll denied means that much more in local taxes, local loss of business, and local relief rolls. This matter goes deeper than a mere acquiring of machinery and seriously affects the economic and moral fiber of our way of life. Governments by their taxing powers are rapidly destroying the competitive quality of American manufacturers and the unrestricted right grants competition for country to bid on American requirements, especially in nontaxpaying corporations and Government purchasing sets an example that can be and is in some quarters, destructive and devastating to our economic well-being. I request a delay in the granting of this contract and that the work be given to American workmen and American plants.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

JEANNETTE, PA., February 5, 1959.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our members in locals 1145 and 2380 are greatly disturbed over rumors going around Jeannette regarding Government purchases or Government approval to purchase foreign made turbine generator units. We asked Elliott management for facts regarding this situation and they are as follows: "Recently Medina Electric Cooperative at Hando, Tex., took bids on two 22,000-kilowatt turbine generator units with an opinion on third duplicate unit. Four domestic and one foreign bid were received. Developments indicate Medina expects to award the order to Brown-Boveri who would manufacture this equipment abroad. All awards by cooperatives are subject to REA Administrator approval in Washington. Elliott advises they made a serious attempt to secure this business in view of the reduced operations at both the Jeannette and Ridgway plants." At the Jeannette plant we have over 50 percent of our people on layoff, and an additional layoff is scheduled for the end of this week. At Ridgway plant over 60 percent are on layoff. We hope you will do everything possible to prevent approval of this award to a foreign bidder. While we do not know if Elliott would be the successful domestic bidder, such an award to them would mean many man-

hours' work for the people in Jeannette and Ridgway. Your help is earnestly solicited.

STEWART W. WELLS,
President, Local 2380 United Steel
Workers of America,
WILLIAM P. WEIGHTMAN,
President Local 1145, United Steel
Workers of America.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 12, 1959.

Mr. RIGGS SHEPPARD,
Medina Electric Corp., Hando, Tex.:

Unemployed workers of Elliott Co. in Jeannette, Pa., appeal to you through me for reconsideration of generator order apparently destined to go to Switzerland. We have less than 40 percent production with acute unemployment production. This order desperately needed to help local employment and business.

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress, 21st District of
Pennsylvania.

PITTSBURGH, PA., February 12, 1959.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives:

We understand that a contract for a large steam turbine generator has been given to the C. A. Parsons & Co., Ltd., of England, rather than to Westinghouse, which was the lowest American bidder. This order would have given thousands of man-hours of work to our members here at East Pittsburgh where more than 3,000 are now unemployed and living off unemployment compensation. Many of these have 17 years of service. Our members who are still employed are sharing time and drawing half wages. If it is our Government's policy to create employment in other countries at the expense of our own welfare, then something must be done. We find it difficult to satisfactorily explain to the unemployed members of our union that our Government has seen fit to contract their type of work to people in other countries. We would appreciate knowing your position on this vital matter that, in effect, means food on the table for our members. It is regrettable that we find ourselves calling this matter to your attention, for up to now, we have assumed that our respected and responsible Government officials would be looking after the best interests of American workmen, who are also, after all, both voters and taxpayers. Although at present it seems that this is completely forgotten, we demand that an immediate investigation be made of this short-sighted policy and that corrective measures be taken immediately to alleviate what has developed into critical unemployment conditions in our area.

PAUL CARMICHAEL,
President.

TOM SULLIVAN,
Business Agent.

JAMES FERACE,
Chief Steward, Local 601, IUE-AFL-CIO.

PITTSBURGH, PA., February 12, 1959.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Resolution sent by wire this date. Our membership of 5,500 Westinghouse Electric salaried employees respectfully urge your influence in proposing congressional investigation into policies of TVA. While thousands of Westinghouse workers remain idle in a labor surplus area, TVA awards a multimillion dollar turbogenerator contract to a foreign competitor, while Westinghouse was the lowest domestic bidder. This contract would have provided 700 Westinghouse employees approximately 2 years of work. This policy not only affects business and economy of the Nation. It results in loss of tax income for the Government and could endanger the security of our country.

THOMAS E. O'LEARY,
President, Association of Westinghouse
Salaried Employees.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 13, 1959.

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Com-
mittee, U.S. Senate.

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGSON,
Chairman, Senate Rules and Administration,
U.S. Senate.

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
U.S. Senate.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives.

HON. WILBER MILLS,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.

ASSOCIATED PRESS,
UNITED-INTERNATIONAL,
House Press Gallery:

As a direct result of the 4-year extension of reciprocal trades and the President's Executive order cutting bid differential between foreign and American producers and manufacturers from 25 percent to 6 percent, many American industries have been and are being forced to lay off American workmen. Examples: According to information wired me from representatives of the Westinghouse Corp., Pittsburgh, they have just lost \$18 million order to England, and Elliott Co., Jeannette, Pa., appears to be losing contract for \$2 million for generators. I sincerely believe the time has come to reevaluate our position in world trade, reciprocal trades, foreign aid, and their relationship to our chronic and growing unemployment. I believe investigation is in order for both committees of House and Senate in this serious turn of events.

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress,
21st District of Pennsylvania.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 13, 1959.

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.:

Vigorously protest proposed awarding of turbine generator contract to Brown-Boveri of Switzerland by Medina Electric Cooperative of Hondo, Tex. Differential in bid approximately 12 percent. Elliott Co. situated in depressed labor area, Jeannette, Westmoreland County, Pa.

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress,
21st District, Pennsylvania.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 13, 1959.

PAUL CARMICHAEL,
President,
TOM SULLIVAN,
Business Agent,
JAMES FERACE,
Chief Steward,
THOMAS E. O'LEARY,
President, Association of Westinghouse Sal-
aried Employees, Westinghouse Electric
Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Received your wire. Have investigated said order. Your facts correct. This order would have meant \$18 million worth of work for American workmen. Have the same situation for \$2 million worth of work for Elliott Co., Jeannette. This generator contract will be awarded to Switzerland concern. My position was clearly stated when I voted against reciprocal trades during my first year as Congressman. My remarks of opposition have been in the Record time after time. I have been disturbed about the number of labor union executives who are in favor of reciprocal trades and unrestricted foreign aid. This condition caused by Executive order of the President which cut the 25-percent differential previously allowed American producers to 6 percent. I have pointed out that the 6-percent differential

does not even cover the mandated costs through payroll deductions American industries must bear. The time has come for mass demonstrations against the loss of American jobs to revive national pride through buy American. The discouraging thing about this order is that the equipment is being purchased by TVA which is Government subsidized through Government taxation and pays no taxes itself. Rest assured, I shall protest vigorously to Congress in our next session on Monday. It appears that the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, February 10, opposes my fighting the granting of awards of contracts to foreign countries. It appears to be in favor of the Westinghouse and others losing contracts to foreign countries.

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Feb. 10, 1959]

AWARDS AND ALARMS

Congressman JOHN DENT acted as a proper spokesman for his constituency when he protested a Government contract award to a Swiss firm for two turbine generators which a firm in Jeannette, Pa., had bid on building. The relevant Government agency replied that it would review the award.

This same Swiss firm figured in a different case not long ago when it won out as low bidder on a contract for TVA. In reply to a protesting American firm, TVA pointed out that it would save between 35 and 40 percent by accepting the Swiss bid.

Recently there was a well-publicized case in which the Government rejected the bid of an English electrical firm in favor of a much higher bid by a Philadelphia firm. The Government said in that case that it acted in the interests of national security. Chances are, though, it acted primarily out of concern for domestic jobs.

That, of course, is a legitimate concern. The Government has for some time held that when competing with a domestic firm located in an area of substantial unemployment, a foreign bidder must undercut the lowest American bid by 12 percent to win the award. The English firm which lost out to the one in Philadelphia had bid lower by some 17 percent.

In the case concerning Jeannette, it remains to be seen whether Representative DENT and others will be able to alter the award to the Swiss firm. But if this case should go so far as to be reviewed in the light of national security—a sometimes suspect light in questions of trade—the Government should keep in mind that national security can also be hurt by hurting U.S. relations with friendly nations and by offending the cause of liberalized trade among free nations.

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 13, 1959.

The Editor,
Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Your article on proposed award of bid to Swiss for generators called to my attention. I just learned that the differential in the bids was 12 percent. However, Medina Electric has chosen to disregard economic factor and appears to be standing on basis of President's Executive order allowing only 6 percent. Your help in this matter can aid the workers of the city of Jeannette who are fighting for their jobs. Might suggest looking into multimillion-dollar order Westinghouse lost to English concern this week. Sorry to say, there is no hard-and-fast rule on the awarding of contracts in cases such as this. Political preference appears to carry weight. Will elaborate if so desired.

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

SALT-WATER RESEARCH LABORATORY AT SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4402, to provide for the construction of a salt-water research laboratory at Seattle, Wash. It is the sense of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that this bill properly comes within the scope and jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be re-referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

There was no objection.

SPENDING OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily it is not in order to ask a colleague to read your remarks. But I am asking that the Members of the House read the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable JIM WRIGHT, found on pages 2171-2172 of the February 9 RECORD, where he tells about the interest on the national debt.

The very last two paragraphs should be read. They add the thought that I had in mind this morning, which is this: The easiest thing in the world is to give away the other fellow's money. Buy favor with the earnings and savings of others. Of course that is what we have been doing.

Far be it from me to question the inclination or the courage of the Congress, but I am wondering, in view of what the gentleman from Texas said in those last two paragraphs, if it is true that we lack either the inclination or the courage, one or the other, to quit spending. Just borrow and spend and then pass the debt on to future generations. Stop and think about that a minute. Is it not a cowardly procedure to endeavor to gain approval at the expense of others?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks on this same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, following the custom and practice which has been customary and usual in this body for many years; that is, to use this forum of the greatest and freest legislative body in the world, to pay tribute to the freedom and independence and hoped-for liberty of a liberty-loving people from an ancient homeland, who have at the same time done much for our country, I speak of the free Republic of Lithuania. This is a great nation. In our own blood and sinews are the blood and sinews and traditions and customs of peoples of all nations of the world.

I would look forward years in advance to that time when there would be a new people in the world, this new breed with God's blessing, this new race, the American race, which will have in it all the best elements of all these great people. It is not unusual that we say this about Lithuania here because down through the weeks of this session we will say much the same of many other peoples and many other nations that have made and will make us great.

The sense of this body today, I am sure, is that the freedom of all freedom-loving peoples of the world are joined in our hope and the aspiration that one day this Lithuanian Republic freed from the yoke of the foreign tyrant will be able to achieve its destiny in liberty.

To those of Lithuanian extraction in America and to all inhabitants of enslaved Lithuania we take this occasion to reaffirm our pledge of self-determination for all peoples, for all states.

It is idle to speak of peace when whole nations are ground under the heel of tyranny. It is a mockery to talk of negotiations looking to an equitable solution of the issues dividing the East and the West when valiant nations like Lithuania are held in stern and brutal subjection.

It has been well said that foreign policy is forged on the anvil of public discussion, that public opinion is a determining factor in determining policy. Let all take note then that the rank and file of Americans, of all national origins, look with abhorrence on the enslavement of Lithuania.

Today what we say in this assembly will be heard round the world. We call upon liberty-loving people the world over to remember that the Red heel came down with crushing brutality and terrorism in 1944, that the brief flame of rewon Lithuanian independence was tragically snuffed out and Lithuania has been held a prisoner nation to this day in defiance and violation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations.

Above and beyond that, the enslavement of Lithuania is in violation of the spirit of equity among the community of nations, does great violence to international morality, and is a constant affront to the conscience of the world.

Just as the great Lincoln, whose memory was so reverently and poignantly honored in this Chamber last week, said

that a nation "cannot endure half free and half slave," so we say today in the name of Lithuania, as we address ourselves to the aggressors and tyrants: The world cannot endure half free and half slave.

To the Red tyrants who have forcibly impressed once free Lithuania into the Soviet Imperialist Empire we say: Do not try to inveigle us to a so-called peace conference so long as you hold Lithuania and other once-free states in terroristic captivity.

America, the world, the conscience of mankind will never recognize Soviet supremacy over Lithuania; in the fervent prayer and belief that God is still in His heaven and will one day make all things right with the world, we confidently look forward to the day when Lithuania will once again take her place among the free nations of the world.

We can be sure that the anniversary of Lithuanian independence will be remembered in Lithuania. But there will be no festivities—no gay bunting, no unfurled flags, no music—to commemorate it. Rather, it will still be observed in mute if defiant silence, or perhaps in consecration to those ideals, to those ways of life which the Lithuanian people cherish.

In this country, on the contrary, the day will be openly celebrated by the nearly one million Lithuanian Americans who are scattered throughout the States of the Union. Here in this blessed land of freedom these, our fellow-Americans, will, as they have in the past, take occasion to remember their oppressed kinsmen across the oceans and to solemnly pledge again their spiritual and moral support for their eventual liberation.

In this pledge all Americans can join them. We can join them further in the faith and hope that the day of liberation will not be too far distant—that soon the merciless domination of Soviet tyranny will be forced to withdraw or be dissolved.

Such hope for Lithuania and the other captive nations of Eastern Europe is predicated on progress toward a united Europe. A free and united Western Europe could exert such power only and exercise such attraction toward, the eastern captive half as to loosen the bonds of Soviet Communist imperialism and cause the Soviets to withdraw to their own frontiers. Every step toward the unity and the economic and political strength of Europe is therefore a step toward the liberation of these captive peoples.

If we view events in Europe in this light we can be optimistic about the future, for Western Europe is making great strides toward unity and strength. Already the pull toward the West has caused deep unrest in Eastern Germany, has loosened Soviet bonds in Poland, and has lighted the bright beacons of the 1956 Hungarian revolution. The magnet of free West Berlin has further infected the Communist body politic and has caused the Soviet Union to demand a showdown on this symbolic city's continued existence. All of these are signs of severe tensions in the Communist em-

pire that may result in greater freedoms in Eastern Europe.

And so, as we celebrate Lithuania's independence day, we can take hope for the future.

The rape of Lithuania's independence almost two decades ago was one of the worst outrages of our day, and that dastardly act remains as one of the blackest marks which the Soviet Union has earned by its treacherous behavior, particularly when dealing with its weak and innocent neighbors. The methods by which Soviet authorities engineered the signature of a mutual assistance pact with Lithuania early in 1940; the way they stationed Red army forces in all strategic points of the country; how they accused patriotic Lithuanians of sabotage and anti-Soviet activities; how they maneuvered to set up a government totally subservient to their interests, which soon brought Lithuania into the Soviet Union; in all these moves and acts the then Soviet Dictator Stalin rivaled his partner in Berlin.

The Lithuanians had created their first independent state some 700 years ago, in 1253. Since those distant days, Lithuania's long and turbulent history has followed a rather uneven course; it has had its ups and down. That history is marked by greatness and glory during its first few centuries, while misfortune and misery claim a large part in the lives of Lithuanians during most of the last 200 years. During the 14th and 15th centuries, Lithuania became one of the most powerful and great states in all eastern and northern Europe. In the 16th century it was united with Poland under a Lithuanian king, and from then on the fate of the countries were bound together. Late in the 18th century, when Poland lost her independence and most of that country was incorporated into Czarist Russia, Lithuania shared a similar fate. Then for more than a century and a half these stalwart and stout-hearted Lithuanians suffered under the unrelenting Russian regime, though not for a moment did they lose sight of the prime objective they had as their common goal—the attainment of their national political independence.

Toward the end of the First World War, when Russia's czarist regime was overthrown by the revolution, and the new Communist regime had not shown its ugly and inhuman nature, the Lithuanians proclaimed their independence on February 16, 1918. They set up a republic, and a truly democratic form of government was instituted which ruled the new state for two decades. For a score of years Lithuanians enjoyed their hard-earned freedom, worked hard in the task of rebuilding their war-ravaged country, and made significant progress. In this rebuilding and also in reshaping of their destiny they were aided by their friends everywhere, especially by Americans of Lithuanian descent in this country. Then came the Second World War and Lithuania's woes began to multiply. She became one of the earliest victims of that war.

Since then, except for the equally unhappy interregnum of Nazi occupation

for about 2 years, unfortunate Lithuanians have been under the heels of heartless Russian Communists. There they are sealed off from the outside world, from their friends in the free world, and suffer in one huge prison camp, fated to work as slaves for their bosses in the Kremlin. No one is allowed to know of their tragic fate, and none of them is allowed to get out to tell his or her own sad tale. But having heard so many heartrending true stories from peoples suffering under the same cruel masters, we know what they have gone through and what they are likely to endure before they are free. As long as there is no relaxation of the unrelenting Soviet rule over them, they will not know what freedom is, and, much as they strive and wish to have it, it is denied to them by their Communist taskmasters. On this 41st anniversary I join hands with all loyal and patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent and echo their genuine sentiments and feelings, expressing the hope that some day they also have the freedom to celebrate this memorable day, the Lithuanian Independence Day, in their homeland.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader, Feb. 4, 1959]

LITHUANIAN "GOLGOTHA"

EDITOR, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

This year, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry celebrate the 300th anniversary of Lithuanian immigration to the United States. The first Lithuanian immigrant to reach the shores of America was Alexander Carolus Curtius. He was the founder of schools and the first teacher of classics in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam, today's New York.

Most of the Lithuanian immigrants settled in Pennsylvania. Although they were agricultural people in their native land, yet arriving on these shores they went into the coal mines and steel mills of America, contributing their brain and brawn to the making of America.

All these Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, 1 million in all, celebrate this weekend all over America the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the country of their forefathers on February 16, 1918, this independence which was destroyed by Soviet Russia in 1940.

The situation which the Baltic countries—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—have endured throughout the whole written history of Europe, so many vicissitudes of conquest, oppression and tyrannical despotism, has never been so desperate, so painful as now, under the ruthless domination of Soviet Russian regime.

The leaders of these small countries have been executed or exiled. Their farmers have been snatched from their lands and deported. Their folks have been cruelly wrested from their homes, forcibly separated from their families, broken in body and spirit and reduced to vassalage. No darker drama of tyranny and lust has ever been performed on the stage of civilization than the present tragedy of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Lithuania and her two Baltic sister Republics, Latvia and Estonia, are victims of flagrant violation of international treaties. U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee studied recently nearly 1,000 treaties and agreements which the Soviets have entered into with countries all over the world. The committee found that in the short years since the Soviet Russia came into existence, in 1917, its government has broken its word to virtually every country to which it ever gave a signed promise. The Soviet Union

signed treaty of recognition, friendship, and nonaggression with Lithuania and cynically broke those agreements and absorbed Lithuania and the other Baltic countries.

This brings us to the fundamental issue that faces the peoples of the world: Are the international treaties signed by the Soviet Union worth anything? And what can the nations of the world do to see that the agreements are kept? The eyes of the Lithuanian people, along with all others, are today turned toward America to find the answer.

Dr. B. J. KASLAS,
Wilkes College.

COMMITTEE FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE 41ST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, Worcester, Mass., February 11, 1959.

DEAR HONORABLE SIR: It was on February 16, 1918, that Lithuania, one of the Baltic States, declared her independence to the entire world. Today Lithuania is not free for, in June 1940, her territory and institutions were unjustly seized by Soviet Russia. Since then her people have been undergoing a persecution and a tyranny, the like of which the world has not seen for many centuries.

Russia's seizure of Lithuania was so cruel and unjust that the Government of the United States has refused, even to this day, to recognize the de jure absorption of the country by the Soviet. For this we, American-Lithuanians, are and ever will be profoundly grateful.

On the occasion of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day on February 16, 1959, may we reiterate our conviction, and that of freedom-loving peoples, that Lithuania, like all nations, has a God-given right to be free. No one may deprive her or any nation of that right. Yet Russia has done just that to Lithuania. She, therefore, must be condemned and must be forced to leave Lithuania at once and make provisions for the return to Lithuania of all her people, now exiled in Siberia and elsewhere.

Realizing your concern for the freedom of all nations, both large and small, may we, the representatives of the two Lithuanian parishes in Worcester, St. Casimir's and Our Lady of Vilna, and of the Lithuanian-American community of Worcester, comprising in all 55 Lithuanian groups, appeal to you to espouse the just and righteous cause of Lithuania in her struggle to regain freedom. May we kindly count on your generous assistance in every way possible for the eventual and, please God, immediate restoration of Lithuania's independence.

With our heartfelt appreciation for your cooperation, we beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,

J. W. GLAVICKAS,
Chairman.
OLGA O. KERSIS,
Secretary.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, Harrisburg, February 11, 1959.

Gov. David L. Lawrence today issued the following statement, setting aside February 16, 1959, as Lithuanian Independence Day. In his statement, Governor Lawrence said:

"The observance of Lithuanian Independence Day will take place on February 16, 1959—the 41st anniversary of the reestablishment of independence in the Republic of Lithuania.

"This event is celebrated by American citizens of Lithuanian descent, although it cannot be observed in their native country, itself, because of its occupation by the Soviet Union.

"The spirit of independence still burns bright in these men and women and the contributions which they have made to the development of this Nation's democratic way of life have been many.

"In recognition of these contributions, and in recognition of the significance of this day to them and to all those who love freedom, I am designating February 16, 1959, as Lithuanian Independence Day for Pennsylvania."

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON THE 41ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATIONS OF LITHUANIAN, LATVIAN, AND ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

This year we commemorate the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. At this time, it is well for the free world to recall the step-by-step process by which the independence of the Baltic peoples was destroyed after two decades of freedom and progress.

In treaties with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia signed in 1920, Soviet Russia pledged itself to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty in the three countries. Similar pledges were embodied in other agreements signed in the following two decades. The last agreements were pacts of mutual assistance, negotiated at the insistence of the Soviets in September and October 1939. These pacts authorized the stationing of Soviet forces in the Baltic States. The Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs gave solemn assurances that the pacts were innocent and protective in nature, stating that they expressly stipulated the inviolability of the sovereignty of the Baltic States. During the weeks preceding the conclusion of the pacts, however, the U.S.S.R. had already signed secret protocols with Nazi Germany, which recognized the Baltic States as belonging in the Soviet sphere of influence. Immediately after the signing of the pacts of mutual assistance, the U.S.S.R. commenced sending troops into Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. In June 1940, the Soviets demanded that the Governments of the three Baltic States be reorganized, demands which the Baltic States were powerless to resist. The military occupation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia began simultaneously with the formation of new governments. There followed rigged elections which resulted, in July of 1940, in the incorporation of the Baltic States, as Soviet Socialist Republics, into the Soviet Union.

The United States was quick to denounce this aggression, and refused to recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. Today, over 18 years later, we wish to assure the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia once more that they are not forgotten. The United States still aspires, in the words of the Atlantic Charter "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for yielding to me at this time. I wish to congratulate him upon his splendid inspiring address. I agree with what he has said.

I have great admiration for the very fine people of Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, on this Monday, February 16, 1959, the free nations of the world and people everywhere living in freedom salute the courageous Baltic nation of Lithuania. This is the 41st anniversary of the national independence of Lithuania. After this independence was finally proclaimed in February 1918 the Lithuanian people had dreams of developing one of the most prosperous and progressive democracies in all Europe.

For more than two decades, the Lithuanian people diligently and ceaselessly labored to make their homeland a happy and peaceful place in which to live.

Although I do not desire at this time to speak of the great historical events in Lithuanian history, certainly the American people well know that the happy and cherished independence of Lithuania only lasted a few years. With envy and jealousy and suspicion, Communist Russia was not disposed to permit this brave little nation to continue in independent prosperity. Russia was determined to destroy it and in June of 1940 the Red army of Communist Russia marched into Lithuania, overran it, destroyed its political independence, and annexed it to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Since that day in June 1940, the Lithuanian people have not known political freedom. They have suffered under tyranny as only the Russian Communists can create it and make it unbearable.

For centuries, Lithuania was an independent nation composed of hardy, energetic Baltic people. Late in the 18th century, however, Lithuania lost its independence to Russia, and the homeland of the Lithuanian people became a part of the great Russian Empire. For over a hundred years, extending up to the Russian Revolution of 1917, Lithuania was under the regime of the autocratic czars of Russia whose harsh and oppressive rule over this long, long century tried to destroy all hopes and desires for independence.

The spirit and the desire to be free develops and grows within the hearts of men. It is not a quality that grows out of political independence. On the contrary, it is the quality upon which political freedom is based. The spirit and hopes of the Lithuanian people could not be destroyed, and over the long, long century of tyranny under the Russian czars, the fire of freedom and independence still burned in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. At the time of the Russian Revolution in 1917, this spirit burst into flame. Czarist Russia collapsed, and on February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared their national independence once again.

Even though, however, we know this political independence lasted only 20 years, we know that in the hearts of the Lithuanian people it is still very much alive and burns with the vigor of a flaming torch. Suffering for more than 18 years under the oppressive and grinding heel of Soviet Russia, the Lithuanian people still retain their hopes for freedom and liberty. They continue to look forward to that day in the future when the spirit of freedom and peaceful association with their fellowmen will once again flourish throughout their country and Lithuania will take her place among the respected free nations of the world.

During these eventful years of crisis, I have had the honor to represent in the Congress the hallowed ground of America upon which the freedom of America and mankind was born. When the American farmers made their stand in 1776 on Lexington Common and at Concord Bridge, it was their conclusion

and their decision that to be free was far more desirable than to live. They made their determination to make their stand to win freedom or to die. Today, on February 16, 1959, the American people know the spirit of freedom will burn on in the hearts of the Lithuanian people until it once again achieves victory. Like an active volcano the spirit of national freedom always will smolder its strength until it erupts and pours out over its enemies.

Proud and vigorous, with abundant courage, the Lithuanian people some day again will achieve this victory for independence. Over three million Lithuanians on this, their independence day, exist under the tyrannical dictatorship of ruthless communism. This tiny nation, smashed and crushed by the great giant Russia, as a powerful tank would crush a delicate vase, is still alive. It still possesses courage. It still possesses hope. It still possesses the burning fire of freedom. This courage, this hope, this faith, molded together, will some day reassemble the pieces of their delicate vase. Everywhere the Lithuanian people look to this hour of triumph.

Freemen everywhere join today with the Lithuanian people in their plans and in their confidence that this day of victory will soon occur.

In conclusion, surely the men of tyranny know that the flame of freedom can never be stamped out because it burns within the hearts of mankind.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania in his remarks on the occasion of this celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

In my district in my home city of Waterbury is one of the greatest concentrations of people of Lithuanian extraction in any section of the country. These people have made a vital and permanent contribution to our community and to our country. Their sturdy qualities, their capacity for work, and their civic virtues have joined with the contributions of people of other races to make an American whole which is greater than the sum of its parts.

I have known these people instinctively all my life. My father served many of them as a physician. I went to school with the children of the pioneer immigrants. I have played with them on the field of sport. I have served with them in public life, and I have dealt with them in business. In all these fields they have been outstanding and have demonstrated the highest qualities of American citizenship.

To my mind, however, Mr. Speaker, the most important characteristic of these Lithuanian people and their descendants has been their capacity to become assimilated in the American population and to contribute their vital strength to the whole Nation.

No one who is familiar with the history of Lithuania can be surprised at the record of the people of this race in the United States. Through the centuries

Lithuanians showed their qualities of courage and tenacity and their love of independence. The fostering and continuance of their historic language has been an example of the way in which they have preserved cultural values in this destructive world.

With the achievement of independence in 1918, came the true flowering of Lithuanian greatness. Under the sun of liberty, the basic qualities which I have described bloomed and grew. A strong and free Lithuania in those years made a substantial and noteworthy contribution to the welfare of the world. Then, tragically, the heel of tyranny descended upon the neck of this unfortunate country. Today, the Russian dictatorship holds Lithuania in thrall. Freedom has been destroyed. Free institutions have been smashed. Religion is being systematically persecuted. Civil rights no longer have any meaning. Daily we hear reports of cruel persecutions and callous disregard of human rights which we in this blessed country can scarcely believe possible.

We in this country cannot remain uncommitted in this tragic situation. Of course, our sympathies are with the Lithuanian people. Of course, we hope and pray that they will not longer suffer under the force of absolutism. But we must do more than hope and pray. We must continue to make our sentiments clear. We must let the world know where we stand. Finally, we must take every legitimate step in the forums and courts of the world to make known our national support of the Lithuanian people, our horror at their continued enslavement and our firm purpose to exercise all our influence to bring about the day when Lithuanian Independence Day will celebrate an actual fact instead of an historical one.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am very privileged to join our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], in his tribute today. I think that he does us all a great service because he brings not only to mind the present condition of people who have not yet succeeded in getting out from under the Iron Curtain, but he reminds us of what might be our lot should the day ever come when we should fail to win our fight to sustain freedom in the world.

While we in the United States take part gladly in this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence day, it is with mixed feelings that we do so. There is sorrow for the plight of Lithuania today. There is sympathy and admiration for the long-continued struggle of right against might. There is joy in the thought of Lithuania's contributions to humanity—contributions through the ages and those of recent times and to us particularly in the United States.

Lithuania is a name ancient and apart as that of no other people except the Basques. Marked by the preservation of their language, these two peoples can claim antiquity such as that of no other group in Europe. The Lithuanian mark

of individuality, of the continuity of personality, of distinction, has persevered through all the centuries of the Christian era. What other people can boast a linguistic heritage maintaining such pristine purity since the first mention of Lithuania by Tacitus?

Down through the centuries this heritage has been preserved although the country was tiny, the people few, and their history a tragic one. Buffeted between large and strong neighbors, Lithuania nevertheless maintained an independent force battling Russian tribes in the 11th century; attacked by Russians, Poles, and Germans in the 13th century; merging with Poland in the 14th to the 18th centuries. Under the Russian yoke from 1795 to 1915, Lithuania in World War I was again caught between two monster combatants—caught and ravaged, pillaged by first one side and then the other.

Yet Lithuania emerged triumphant. Lithuanian independence was declared. The declaration of February 16, 1918, is the independence we celebrate today. We rejoice together with a people whose courage and perseverance could persist through such age-old vicissitudes.

Today is a day to recall not only the valor and stamina of such people; but particularly to mark the culture which they have preserved from age to age. A religious people, the Lithuanians have maintained their piety and ideals through all generations of stress and disaster. For disaster was to be again their lot in World War II. Russia—the Soviet Union now—was again to seek to dominate this tiny but separate state. The United States has not recognized the results of this latest violence, politically. It deplores the suffering and hardships that persist for the Lithuanians at home. It honors the struggle that endures in the brave hearts and minds of these freedom-loving people.

We in the United States welcome in our midst the Lithuanians of today and yesterday. The Lithuanian-Americans have made many and distinct contributions to the progress of this country. The newcomers to the mining towns of Pennsylvania in the late 19th century were energetic and diversified in their pursuits. To many parts of our country the Lithuanians have come bringing with them devotion to ideals, hard work, and a sense of responsibility for each other as well as for themselves. We find Lithuanian farmers, journalists, tailors, writers, men of the cloth, musicians—in many pursuits and professions—often in closely knit groups, but always with aid for one another. Philanthropy has been typical of the Lithuanian-American. Also in the arts we find many interesting figures emerging from the Lithuanian born or those of Lithuanian parentage. Of particular interest to me are such names in music as Anna Kaskas and Polyna Stoska of Metropolitan Opera fame; Helen Mickunas of radio, opera, concert stage; Joseph Zilevicius, composer and former director of the Conservatory of Music in Klaipeda; Alexander Aleksis, former director of the Conservatory of Music in Warsaw; the stage designer and painter

of water colors, Mstislav Dobujinsky; and Peretz Herbststein, author of "Green Pastures."

We welcome in our midst the personal contributions and distinctive racial characteristics of these people and their descendants. Of such is the New World built. The tremendous progress of our country has depended since colonial times on the influx of ethnic groups with individuality and with the hardihood and perseverance to hold their own through every contingency.

Psychological factors play a significant part in the building and maintenance of a society and in the promotion of its well-being. The independent spirit which marks the individuals who have battled against tyranny, who have maintained their freedom of thought and their ability to put it into action—this spirit is the very essence of Americanism. It is such a love of liberty and a perseverance in demanding it that we celebrate today—Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War I the floodlight of freedom and independence swept over many parts of Europe. Numerous nationalities that were held down for centuries under the autocratic regimes and were often severely oppressed by their alien overlords in their homelands, cast off the heavy yoke of their oppressors and regained their freedom. All this happened during the last year of that war, in 1918. In central, eastern, and northeastern Europe close to one hundred million people who had lost their freedom in the past but who had been struggling for it, saw their most cherished dream come true in 1918. The Lithuanians were among these millions.

The Lithuanians have a distinct place in the turbulent and colorful history of northeastern Europe. They are the most numerous of the three Baltic nationalities, about 3 million in all, and they have always been sturdy defenders of liberty. Although they had borne the heavy yoke of the Russian czarist government for more than a century, they had successfully kept alive their love of liberty and their patriotism. Their tough and tenacious nature, and their unyielding spirit, fortified by their firm belief in Christian principles, served them well in their prolonged years of adversity. During that war they had suffered, but when the czarist regime was overthrown by the Russian Revolution, then they seized the opportunity and proclaimed their independence on February 16, 41 years ago.

Both in the attainment of their independence and in its maintenance during more than two decades, the United States, officially and unofficially, made considerable contribution. Struggling Lithuanians received great encouragement from the late President Wilson's historic fourteen points. To them it was a source of inspiration to know that their struggle for liberty and independence had the backing of our wartime

President and our people. Of course, the large body of our loyal citizens of Lithuanian descent also played a significantly important part.

This patriotic and law-abiding group, numbering more than 500,000 at the time, served the worthy Lithuanian cause just as fervently as they have served their adopted country. Through their own efforts and with aid of their friends abroad the war-torn Lithuania pulled itself out of existing chaos by its own boot straps. By 1920 Russian and German troops had been driven out, and, barring the unfortunate question of their capital city Vilna, Lithuanians settled their internal and external problems; they evolved a stable government and a balanced economy in agriculture, industry and trade. The Lithuanian Republic was recognized by the governments of other countries; it was admitted into the League of Nations and thus took its place in the international community. For about two decades the people worked hard and succeeded in making their historic country a prosperous and progressive democracy. They were happy and justly proud of their accomplishments.

Unfortunately this happy period lasted for only two decades. Early in 1939 storm clouds began to gather on the horizon; dictatorships of Hitler and Stalin seemed to be threatening independent Lithuania, but the latter was the deadlier of the two. At the beginning of the last war, Stalin felt free to act. He forced upon the helpless Lithuanians a "mutual assistance pact" early in 1940 whereby the country became partly occupied by Red army forces. Then in mid-June under the pretext that there were anti-Soviet forces in the country, Stalin moved in with the ostensible purpose of eliminating them, but actually he placed the country under military occupation. Under Russian guns, a Soviet style election was held; the emerging new pro-Soviet Government "requested" that Lithuania be incorporated into the Soviet Union. This was done on July 21, 1940.

Since that unhappy day the fate of Lithuania has been chained to totalitarian dictatorships. In the course of the last war, for about 2 years, Nazis occupied Lithuania and, of course, under such occupation Lithuanians suffered. Then toward the end of the war Soviet forces came back, took over the country, and since then they have been administering it as a Soviet colony. The once independent Lithuania, a real window between East and West, has been sealed up. It is impossible to learn much of the sad fate of unfortunate Lithuanians. For a long time the entire Baltic region was closed even to the select few who were privileged to visit the Soviet Union. Recently, however, some persons from the West were allowed to make limited and guided tours there, and their impressions are disheartening. There is no freedom of any kind. The people are restricted in their movements even within the country, and are watched over by Communists and Soviet agents. The authorities have done everything in their power to obliterate

and wipe out all vestiges of the past. Nationalist and Christian ideals are proscribed, and those suspected of harboring such antirevolutionary ideas are arrested, sentenced, and severely punished. But even under such oppressed and inhumane conditions, Lithuanians have not lost hope of their eventual freedom. They have not forgotten their independence day, even though they are not permitted to celebrate it. We in the free world, and particularly in the United States, celebrate that event and thus echo their genuine sentiments. I am indeed glad to join Americans of Lithuanian descent on this day, in commemorating the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, and that their strong hope and permanent desire for the restoration to Lithuania of its independence and freedom will be quickly attained.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have perhaps a little different interest and a personal one in the cause that is being advocated today. I subscribe to it wholeheartedly. But a number of years ago a family came to my farm sponsored by the church that I attend. The story came to my attention of a family that fled from Lithuania with a horse and buggy and in it were the meager belongings of this family and their three children. They eventually fled to Germany and were there five years, and then came to America as a displaced family. The pastor of my church came to me and asked me if I would take them out to my farm and give them a place to live until they became adjusted to this country. So here came Jonas and Marie Dumpys, the father and mother, and their children Martin, Hans, and Ruth.

They established themselves well and learned to speak the American language. They went on to school. All of them got a job. Today they own a home in Hutchinson. They own an automobile. The daughter is a graduate nurse. The son is studying for the ministry, and the youngest boy, Martin, is in the Air Force.

Seeing the quality and the industry of this family can only emphasize the tremendous opportunity that must be ours to help that little country become liberated again. I join with all of the gentlemen in the hope that their endeavors and their objectives may be gained.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1959, the Lithuanians celebrate the 41st anniversary of their declaration of independence. This, their independence day, recalls the day in 1918 when, at the end of World War I, freedom again was restored to this troubled land. This independence and freedom did not come easily. It came through struggle, hardship, and bloodshed. It came much in the way that the people

of our own Thirteen Colonies fought for and won freedom and independence.

For more than 20 years Lithuania grew in stature. Major progress was made in agriculture and industry. Improvements in transportation and education, great strides in land reform and social legislation, and remarkable gains in material and spiritual well-being were products of these golden years of independence. I had the privilege of visiting this land during those years.

But this hard-fought freedom came to an end in March 1939. Today Lithuania is an enslaved nation ruled by a puppet government. Her people are scattered throughout slave-labor camps of Europe and the wastes of Siberia. One-fourth of her population has died at the hands of her Soviet oppressors.

No one who is familiar with the dark chapter of Soviet exploitation in the 20th century need be told what the ironshod heels of the Red army brought to that fair and happy land whose people had learned the joys of freedom.

It is indeed sad to reflect upon the fact that today, the independence day of Lithuania, it is only outside, in the free world—in countries to which Lithuanians have brought their great cultural heritage—that the anniversary of her independence can be celebrated. Only in the free world can Lithuanians speak for their countrymen, living in the silenced homeland, of their unceasing struggle for independence and freedom.

Let us, therefore, on the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania join with our Lithuanian friends everywhere in reasserting our firm opposition to Soviet aggression. Let us tell the one million Americans of Lithuanian descent that we stand shoulder to shoulder with them in our prayers and work for their countrymen. Let us pledge never to forget our obligations to the people of Lithuania and other captive nations who have known for so many years the grinding heel of oppression, but who, through it all, have not succumbed to the doctrines of their oppressor but have rallied their strength and courage to meet the overwhelming obstacles. Why can they face their oppression with courage? Because the divine spark burns in each Lithuanian heart, and their desire for and love of the freedom that we know—and they tasted—drives them on.

We today, in commemorating that glorious day 41 years ago when Lithuania declared her independence, hope to kindle anew the hope of our Lithuanian friends and encourage their every effort to stand stalwart in their dark days of oppression and look forward to the day that Soviet oppression can no longer separate them from freedom.

To the 20,000 Americans of Lithuanian descent living in my own State of California, I wish to send words of hope that the brutal yoke of the oppressors may soon be lifted from the shoulders of their countrymen and that the freedoms we love and cherish may again settle as a protective blanket over that courageous country of Lithuania so her people's dreams of independence may again become a reality.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I had the high honor and the great privilege last year in Philadelphia at the national convention of the Knights of Lithuania of receiving from that distinguished organization the gold medal for distinguished service for that society and for that country and that people. This coming Sunday, in the same city of Philadelphia, I will be privileged to address the annual exercises joining in commemoration of this ceremony today, and I shall be happy to convey to that meeting the spirit of this meeting in this assembly.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to have the privilege of joining with the people of Lithuania in commemorating the 41st anniversary of their independence. Freedom-loving people everywhere will join with the Americans of Lithuanian birth and descent in New York and throughout the world in observing this day as Lithuanian Independence Day.

Although the brave nation of Lithuania only dated its modern independence from February 16, 1918, the date we are commemorating today, the people of Lithuania have a long and glorious history behind them. Their traditions, their language, their culture, and their constant desire for freedom are reasons why the foreign occupation of their homeland since 1940 has not been able to dampen the spirit of independence in their hearts.

This anniversary should be a constant reminder to all the free peoples of the world of the treachery and evilness practiced by the Soviet tyrants. It should instill in all of us a renewed determination to protect our liberties and should imbue us with the will to fulfill our obligations toward the defenseless people behind the Iron Curtain.

I extend my best wishes to the gallant Lithuanian patriots and feel confident that the great spirit which helped sustain Lithuania through other periods of moral and physical slavery will sustain them once again. I fervently pray that their freedom is near at hand and that their nation will enjoy complete restoration of independence.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, today Lithuanians in the free world will gather together to observe the 41st anniversary of the independence of their country. For although their country is under the heel of Red oppression, the idea of a free and independent Lithuania is as strong today as it was in 1918 when the Republic was first declared.

It is especially fitting that the American people pause to pay tribute to a gallant people who have contributed so freely of themselves in the building of this great Nation. They have given their indomitable spirit, their labor, and their lives in the furtherance of our democratic way of life. There are in this country today nearly 1 million citizens of Lithuanian origin. They have left a proud record in every aspect of the American way of life.

But our bond with the people of Lithuania goes beyond this. It is the common bond that holds free men everywhere together. The Lithuanians have

shared and worked for the same tradition of liberty and independence as we have. Theirs has been a hard and bitter struggle to maintain this Western tradition. For centuries the Russians have tried to eradicate all traces of democracy and nationalism in Lithuania, but without success. They have banned the language, the religion, the literature. They have resorted to mass murder and deportation. Always they have met with failure.

It is, therefore, for us, the free, to affirm our faith and our hope in the future destiny of the Lithuanian people. The flame of liberty burns brightly in the hearts of Lithuanians. Our task is to continue to enkindle this flame in their hearts until the day of final liberation.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, recent and current international events have caused misery and misfortune to many peoples; some have suffered and are still suffering under tyranny. Their lot has been truly tragic. That has been true with the Lithuanian people.

These brave and courageous people who had regained their independence in the First World War, were not allowed to enjoy their richly deserved freedom very long. After regaining it in 1918, upon proclaiming the Lithuanian Republic on February 16 of that year, they lived in joy and worked ceaselessly and happily in making their small and devastated country a happy home for all Lithuanians. For more than 20 years they made the most of their freedom and were perfectly content with their democratic way of life. But the outbreak of the Second World War ushered in sad days for them. They were robbed of their independence by Communist Russians; the country was made part of the Soviet Union, and they were forced to submit to the unbending and stern rule of the Kremlin.

That is the unhappy and unenviable lot of some 3 million Lithuanians today in their homeland. There they work for their taskmasters and pray for their deliverance from Moscow's tyranny.

In observing the 41st anniversary of their independence day, we pay tribute to their steadfastness and courage, and hope that soon they will be free to enjoy the fruits of their labor in their homeland.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in paying tribute to the brave people of the Republic of Lithuania, whose freedom was first proclaimed 41 years ago today. On that date, the courageous people of Lithuania had finally climaxed a long struggle for freedom by achieving genuine independence.

But, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the people of Lithuania are no longer free, because since 1940 this brave small country on the Baltic has been a Soviet concentration camp and its people the victims of ruthless Communist domination. The iron chain of Communist tyranny keeps Lithuania in a state of constant terror and exploitation by her Kremlin masters.

Today, when Lithuania cannot speak for herself, it is a privilege to speak for that country of indomitable courage and

undying devotion to freedom. The people of Lithuania are dedicated to the principles of individual liberty and national independence, and they have maintained their national identity in spite of their long term of enslavement.

The history of the noble Lithuanian people shows unmistakably that freedom is part of the Lithuanian character. Since the 13th century Lithuania has enjoyed independence and self-government only at intervals between invasions by the Russians and Teutons in their mad rush for conquest and European domination. After more than 100 years of struggling against czarist Russian subjugation, Lithuania became a republic and proudly took its place among the democratic nations of the world. Unfortunately her independence was short lived; after 22 years of freedom and progress, Lithuania was seized again by Soviet Russia in 1940.

The people of Lithuania remain a captive nation of Soviet Russia, subjugated and enslaved under Communist tyranny. They have paid a great toll in human suffering; yet they have never given up their hopes for national liberation. Behind the Iron Curtain they are sealed off from any contact with the rest of the world. But they are not forgotten by freedom-loving men. This anniversary of independence fought for, earned, cherished, but lost, continues to be observed in the hearts of the people of Lithuania as well as in the hearts of all who love freedom everywhere. The Soviet masters can capture their bodies, but not their minds and souls. There is no Lithuanian flag in Lithuania, no national anthem—but these symbols of a liberated Lithuania still burn brightly in their hearts.

Meanwhile, this observance here and throughout other lands where people of Lithuanian blood are living today will be heard behind the Iron Curtain. It will demonstrate that the plight of Lithuania is not forgotten, and that we join with them and with Lithuanians everywhere in prayer that the day of freedom for these brave and valiant people shall not be far away. It will demonstrate to the Communist jailors and to the world that we in America recognize that freedom is indivisible and that not until the day when the people of Lithuania are genuinely free can we in America fully enjoy and appreciate our own freedom.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy today to join with all Americans of Lithuanian descent in paying tribute on the 41st anniversary of the birth of Lithuania as a free and sovereign nation of the world. I am certain that I am joined in these sentiments not only by all lovers of freedom in the United States but by all throughout the civilized world who respect honesty, integrity and the rights of all peoples to self-government.

It is a tragic fact that the independence of Lithuania was a short-lived one for not too long after the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact, Lithuania fell before the red scourge of communism.

None the less, Lithuania still is alive today. The U.S. Government to its everlasting credit has steadfastly refused to

recognize the rape of the Lithuanian Republic by the Soviet Union. Thus, for the record, Lithuania lives on awaiting a new birth of freedom.

As I stated at the outset, I believe it is only proper and fitting for us to pay homage to the suppressed people who have struggled on so valiantly against the worst form of tyranny. It is true that the more than 3 million Lithuanians in their homeland today may not hear us directly but I am sure they are with us in spirit. Further I am certain that some day the tragic ordeal of this gallant country will come to an end and that an independent and sovereign Republic of Lithuania will once again be able to take its rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is a small country in northeastern Europe, and the Lithuanian people constitute one of the smaller ethnic groups in that part of the world, but there they have played an exceptionally important role. The state they founded some 700 years ago endured for centuries, and at one time was a real force in East European affairs. Early in modern times the Lithuanian Kingdom was united with that of Poland, and from then on the fate of both peoples were wedded. Finally, late in the 18th century, when Poland was partitioned and ceased to be an independent state, Lithuania also suffered a similar fate and became a Russian Province.

From then on, for more than 100 years, Lithuanians lived under the autocratic and oppressive czarist regime, but they clung to their national traditions with stubborn tenacity and held fast to certain high ideals, such as freedom, liberty, and independence; and when they had the chance to realize these ideals, they seized upon it and proclaimed their independence. This was done on February 16, 1918, and Lithuania became a republic. At that time the war was still raging and most of the country was under enemy occupation. Soon, however, the war ended and all Lithuanians joined hands not only in the fullness of joy to celebrate their victory, but also for the rebuilding of their now liberated country. In this task they were astonishingly successful. In a few years Lithuania was blessed with prosperity and progress. For more than two decades they lived in happiness and freedom. But then came the rude shock caused by the Second World War. Early in that war Russian Communists robbed Lithuania of its freedom and made the country part of the Soviet Union.

Since then, for more than 18 years, Lithuanians have been suffering under the worst of totalitarian dictatorships. Commissars and spy rings, paid and unpaid agents of the Communists, and planted informers and cruel executioners have literally changed the life in Lithuania to one of regimented horror. But even under such horrors and terrors, the unhappy but stouthearted Lithuanian has not given up hope for his eventual freedom. On this 41st anniversary celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day we all hope and pray that his wish will come true and that he will be rewarded

with freedom and independence in his beloved Lithuania.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, on the 41st anniversary of the event, there cannot be any independence day celebrations in Lithuania. It is for those of us in the free world who remember Lithuania's freedom, and who hope for its resurrection, to mark this day of independence. We do so without hopelessness, for the spirit of Lithuanian nationalism has been able to survive Russian oppression once before.

The Lithuanians came under Tsarist control at about the same time the United States Constitution was ratified. In the ensuing years, while Americans have known only freedom, the proud people of Lithuania have known only terror and suppression. The Tsars of Russia even abolished the name of Lithuania. They smashed all forms of local autonomy, suppressed the use of the Lithuanian language, and did all in their power to remove any trace or memory of Lithuania's proud heritage.

They failed, for as the old Russian regime fell, and Lithuania came under German occupation during the First World War, the patriots of Lithuania declared their country's independence, on the 16th of February 1918. It was a time of great events all over Europe, and nationalities which had been held down for centuries under the old regimes now tasted once again their new freedom. All these peoples, like the Lithuanians, were fired by the ideals of President Wilson's 14 points, and they proceeded to establish democratic governments. Independent Lithuania was soon recognized by the great powers, and in 1921 the long oppressed people had new reason for pride when their government became a member of the League of Nations.

For more than 20 years, throughout the interwar period, this intelligent and industrious people made remarkable progress toward establishing stability. They achieved a balanced economy in trade, industry, and farming. From the ruins of war great strides were made in establishing a prosperous, progressive democracy. This happy period, in which so many of the aspirations of Lithuanian nationalism were finally reaching fruition, was doomed to end as the fear of war began to engulf all Europe. There was increasing diplomatic pressure from the Soviet Union, and eventually, as a war broke out, the unfortunate Lithuanians had to allow the Red army into the country. Finally, under threats of death and imprisonment for all who refused to accede, Lithuanians had to join the Soviet Union—another victim.

Thus Lithuanian independence came to an end, but free peoples were not fooled by this heavyhanded act of Soviet despotism. The United States and Great Britain knew that the incorporation of Lithuania into the Red bloc was against the wishes of the Lithuanian people, and they refused to recognize the Communist regime.

Since that unhappy day, however, Lithuania's fate has been determined by the acts of totalitarian dictators. Not very long after the Russians moved into Lithuania, the Nazis ousted the Soviets

and took over themselves. The result was 3 years of the most sickening and heartbreaking oppression, terror and fear. Under the Nazis, hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were slaughtered, others were pressed into a war in which they had no concern, and thousands more were made to do slave labor.

Toward the end of the Second World War the Red forces returned, and reestablished their control over Lithuania. As we might expect, it meant a continuation of slavery. The Russians, now adding the venom of their Marxist ideology, have been determined to stamp out all vestiges of Lithuania's past. Religion and nationalism are suppressed and all opposition is cruelly punished. But we in the free world know that the Lithuanians have not forgotten the past—we know that no amount of dictatorship and terror can obliterate the spiritual freedom of a people.

One of the basic reasons why we look with confidence to the future knowing that Lithuania will some day again be a free democratic country is that in its resistance to this Communist oppression it has on its side its greatest national virtue, that of intense devotion to Christianity. The Lithuanian nation is predominately Roman Catholic in faith with other Christian sects also a vital part of the Lithuanian national life. This intense traditional devotion to Christianity gives the Lithuanian people the necessary inner strength to survive against the materialistic onslaught of its atheistic communistic oppressor. For that reason we join all Lithuanians, and especially Americans of Lithuanian descent, in remembering this day, the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the staunchest and stoutest champions of freedom and independence in Europe are to be found among the northeast Europeans. They all have learned to fight in adversity and often against fearful odds, but they have fought bravely even in a losing battle. The Lithuanians are such a people. Throughout their modern history they have fought hard and fought courageously for high ideals against the forces of oppression, and tyranny. As a matter of fact, most of their modern history may be written in terms of unending struggles against their oppressors. For centuries they fought against Russia's autocracy. Their unyielding and uncompromising spirit, their firm resolve to cling to certain high ideals, and their firm belief in basic principles of Christian civilization have served them well in times of distress and despondency. During all that time they awaited for the chance to free themselves, and in 1918 that chance was theirs.

On February 16 of that year, even before the end of the First World War, they proclaimed their national political independence, and in their historic homeland they established a working democratic government. That government lasted for more than two decades, and during that time the people enjoyed the blessings of freedom. Unfortunately, soon after the outbreak of the last war the Lithuanians once more found them-

selves in a desperate situation. Then their independence became one of the first casualties of the war. In July of 1940 the country was occupied by the Red army and annexed to the Soviet Union. Since then Lithuanians have been denied personal and national freedom in their historic homeland.

Today millions of innocent, helpless, and patriotic Lithuanians are not permitted to celebrate the Lithuanian Independence Day in their homeland, or even to talk or write about it. There they suffer under the totalitarian Communist dictatorship imposed upon them by the rulers in the Kremlin. They live in dread of the secret police, of imminent arrest, imprisonment, and often in fear of being shipped off to some distant and desolate part of the Soviet Union. On this memorable day, in commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day, I gladly join Americans of Lithuanian descent and pray for the deliverance of their unfortunate kinsmen from Communist oppression and tyranny.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, today we stand once more in proud commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence. We again bear witness to the eternal truth that all men are endowed with the right to individual and national freedom. Again we declare our own faith that no individual in any land has the right to deprive his fellow man of human liberty.

It was over 700 years ago that the independent state of Lithuania came into being. In the long history of this indomitable people, the struggle for freedom and independence has never ceased—even against the Russians who succeeded in extending their domination over Lithuania for more than a century.

The free spirit of Lithuania rose again in 1918 when full independence was again proclaimed—and as do free men everywhere, the people set themselves successfully to the task of rebuilding the nation and developing her industry, commerce, agriculture, science, and education. Their success did more than contribute to their national well-being: it was an outward and visible sign of their strong devotion to the cause of freedom and human rights, as they demonstrated that only under freedom can be obtained the highest level of prosperity and human development. That spirit still glows, despite the present incorporation of their land into the U.S.S.R. under conditions which deny basic human rights.

The Lithuanian cause, therefore, is of deep concern to all freedom-loving people. Again I reiterate, so long as one nation or even one man is deprived of liberty, the liberty of all men is indeed in jeopardy. The peace of our world, for which we all long and pray, depends upon the preservation of human rights, for man, born to be free, will not willingly or long wear the yoke of domination.

So today we join with all Lithuanians everywhere in celebrating the restoration of their independence and rededicating ourselves with them to the cherished cause of freedom. Sadly we realize the tragedy inherent in the fact that

Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain cannot themselves openly commemorate this traditional occasion. We are sure, however, that the instinct for freedom, the memory of freedom lives in their hearts and that their faith in the eventual deliverance of their nation will never weaken. We pray with them that that day of freedom will soon come.

And in so praying, we are joined today by all Americans of Lithuanian descent, whose spirit of independence and love of freedom have so enriched our own national life. Their dedication to the cause of independence for their motherland—and their equal dedication to the cause of freedom and justice for all men—continually rekindles in this country our own clear flame of independence. We are grateful for them, as we stand together in witness to the right of all men to walk in freedom and human dignity.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, once again it is not only my privilege but the privilege of many of us elected representatives of our great Nation to pay homage and tribute to the brave people of Lithuania, lovers of liberty, who have suffered so much and have displayed their intense dedication to the just cause of free people. It is especially appropriate at this time while we Members of the Congress are endeavoring to reach great decisions which have to do with freedom in the world and the establishment of a lasting peace, that we pause for a moment to honor this small but valiant nation. When we remember Lithuania we are reminded of what has happened to the people of Hungary, of the enslavement of Poland, of the ruthless demands of communism over the people of Germany, of the tragedy of Rumania, and the enslavement of China. All this is emphasized by the recent visit to our shores of that mastermind of intrigue and deceit, that ruthless and civil champion of communism, Anastas Mikoyan.

We hear little or nothing about Lithuania these days. This nation is suppressed by Communist Russia, cloistered behind an Iron Curtain that is never raised, where visitors are not permitted to enter and natives rarely allowed to depart. This policy is shamelessly and cruelly adhered to by the Communists in spite of the assurances which are given almost daily that visitors to Russia may go anywhere and see for themselves what communism is doing for the Russian people. What little is known about the economic situation in this valiant country indicates that poverty and a reign of terror with political executions are the order of the day, and that planned starvation and exile of the natives to death camps in various parts of the Russian empire are ruthlessly carried on. The Russians may claim to be ahead of the world in the development of nuclear science but, although they do not claim it, there can be no dispute about their leadership in bringing sorrow, devastation, and distress to the innocent people whom they conquer by force and might. In the face of such conditions the indescribable courage of countries like Lithuania is insurance that the ideology of Communism will

never survive because no freeminded people will ever forget the bestial brutality and faithlessness of the leaders of the Russian people. The indomitable will of these wonderful people of Lithuania shines as a beacon for truth, honesty, courage, and liberty in the world.

It is right for us to be proud of the attitude that our country has taken toward the Lithuanian Republic. We have refused to recognize the Russian domination and its forceful absorption of this gallant nation. We continue to recognize its diplomatic and consular representatives in the United States and by so doing we honor our own heritage and keep alive in the hearts of the tortured people throughout the world the love of liberty and the hope and faith in the righteousness of things. It is unthinkable that we should ever fail the Lithuanians for we cannot be false to our own ideals, but let us take courage and strength, and be fortified by the example set by this nation in its love of liberty. The United States must continue and strengthen our dedication to the cause of justice and freedom, and by our good will and interest in the welfare of these stricken people we may keep alive the fire of hope and the determination that the dawn of a better day will come to pass.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence commemorating the end of over a century of oppression is an occasion for sorrow as well as joy. Tyranny under Soviet Communist rule has again enveloped Lithuania and temporarily destroyed her hard-won freedom which was realized on February 16, 1918, when she proclaimed her national independence.

I would like to join with the nearly 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent who are pausing to commemorate this event in expressing hope and prayers for the emergence of a free Lithuania soon. We in America can help by keeping the story of the tragedy of Lithuania before the other nations of the world. We can show that we will remain resolute in our fight against Communist aggression. America's continued refusal to recognize the annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union and our constant condemnation of the enslavement of free peoples of the world by force are means by which we can help the freedom-loving people of Lithuania.

Past history has shown that the Lithuanian people have the ability to withstand a great deal of tyranny. Not even the Russians' planned program of genocide can eliminate the love of liberty and the dreams of independence of the Lithuanian patriots.

Let us never forget our obligations to the people of Lithuania and other captive nations so that their day of delivery from under the heel of their cruel oppressors may be speeded.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, freedom and independence are the most cherished aims of individuals and nations, and their attainment, both by individuals and nations, have always been regarded as the successful culmination of their struggle toward those supreme goals. In the case of nations when these dreams

come true, when these rewarding tasks are successfully accomplished, and when those who have carried on the fight, regain their liberty and freedom, and independence, then all hardships and tribulations, all sacrifices and sufferings, are forgotten, and the memorable occasion becomes enshrined in national annals as a national holiday. And if the nation is fortunate and powerful enough to safeguard and maintain this supreme prize, then its anniversary is observed with due solemnity. In some cases these annual events sometimes become perfunctory, and their celebration becomes somewhat routine. This is partly because the people take their freedom and independence for granted, think of liberty and independence as their birthrights, and as such their inalienable possessions, never to be subjected to debate or dispute. Happy the nation that finds itself in such an enviable situation for any length of time, especially in these perilous times. But the observance of independence day anniversaries has another meaning and bears another message to those less fortunate peoples and nations, who, having regained their independence after a long and arduous struggle carried on against heavy odds, often formidable odds, and having sacrificed nearly all their worldly possessions and many of their dear ones, find themselves once more without liberty and independence, without the freedom which they had regarded as the spiritual sinews of their life. The tragedy of the Lithuanian people is of this kind.

These hardy and hardworking, brave and courageous people, have been living in their historic homeland on the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea from times immemorial. There they had founded their independent state and had become a sovereign nation centuries before Columbus discovered America. Though at no time in their long history were they more than a few millions, their important part in the history of Eastern Europe bears no relation to their present small size as a nation. For a long time they formed a powerful empire extending far to the south into the Ukraine and beyond, and there became a veritable force against the Asiatic hordes invading Europe. Then early in modern times the Lithuanian Kingdom was united with that of Poland, forming a dual monarchy. And in the late 18th century, when Poland was partitioned and a good part of it fell to Russia, Lithuania also became a province of the czarist empire. Thus had come to an end the glorious days of Lithuanian history; thenceforth they were to endure the oppressive yoke of the czars and suffer in the hands of their callous and cruel agents.

For nearly 150 years until the First World War, they lived in their homeland as subjects of the czars without losing their Lithuanian nationality, and their fine national traits. They also clung tenaciously and with uncommon determination to some of their most cherished national ideals: freedom, liberty, independence. Throughout this long period they strove hard to keep alive these ideals and Lithuanian national traditions. Often they had to resort to un-

derground and clandestine methods to succeed in their efforts; when detected and caught in these "treasonable" acts, they gladly suffered the consequences in prisons and exile, not infrequently sacrificing their very lives. Still they persisted in their struggle against powerful forces under all kinds of handicaps, and instead of submitting and yielding, they doubled and redoubled their efforts in the firm belief that they were entitled to freedom and independence. Then the day of reckoning came to the czarist regime in Russia; in 1917 revolutionary forces overthrew the despotic remnant of medieval days. When it was shattered beyond repair, the peoples who were held in chains by that autocratic regime felt free to regain their liberty and proclaim their independence. The Lithuanians were one of these peoples.

On February 16, 1918, 41 years ago, they proclaimed their national independence in their historic homeland and instituted their own democratic republic. That was a joyful day for the Lithuanians and also to their friends and sympathizers everywhere. We in particular in this country were delighted. Not only so many of our loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent had a share in the making of new Lithuania, but the Lithuanian people were encouraged and inspired by our former President Wilson. Thus, freed from the deadly hand which held them down for so long, and aided both spiritually and materially by their friends, the Lithuanians rolled up their sleeves and got down to work. In the course of a bare two decades, during the relatively short interwar period allotted to them, they worked hard, ceaselessly, and accomplished near miracles. The war-ravaged country was rebuilt; the democratic regime took firm roots, and in nearly all aspects of their lives Lithuanians made tremendous advances; they prospered and progressed. Everyone thrived through their industry and hard work, and everyone was happy. Then approached another event over which they had no control. As the clouds of the Second World War were darkening the horizon, they became apprehensive; they began to worry about their independence, and even for their safety. Unfortunately, their worst fears and forebodings came true. Early in the course of that war, when Lithuania's friends in the West were in a life-and-death struggle, Stalin's forces treacherously invaded the country, occupied it, and hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were arrested and shipped to distant and desolate corners of the Soviet Union and those left behind in the country were to submit to the stern rule of Communist dictatorship of the Kremlin. In July of 1940 Lithuania was annexed to the Soviet Union and thus came to an end the Lithuanian Republic that was born on February 16, 1918.

During the last war Lithuanians suffered much and sacrificed nearly all their worldly possessions. Though theoretically not a combatant nation in that war, yet they lost more than many nations who as such fought in that war. For a time they came under the Nazi regime, and their lot was hardly any better under Hitler's underlings. To-

ward the end of the war when the Red Army reentered Lithuania, Communists returned in greater force and with greater fury. They set out to eradicate all traces of nationalism and freedom in the country. All personal possessions were confiscated by the state; and everything is owned by the state and operated for the state. All citizens in this totalitarian setup are mere cogs in the big state machine. Every phase of their daily life is rigidly regulated by the state. Regimentation is carried to its absurd limits, far beyond what one finds even in the armed forces in democracies of the West. No freedom or liberty is allowed to the people. The country is sealed off from the free world. No movement is permitted in and out of the country, and of course visitors from the free world are absolutely forbidden to enter, except under most rigid and supervised guidance.

Such being the almost unprecedented and unfortunate situation, we in the free world do not exactly know what happens there. We rarely hear of the unenviable lot of these unhappy and helpless Lithuanians, and that little is discouraging, almost despairing. All is black in that land of misfortune under Communist totalitarian dictatorship. All Lithuanians live there as prisoners in a large prison camp, fated to work as slaves for the all-powerful and heartless Communist state. The one encouraging and hopeful sign in this array of darkness and sadness is that these liberty-loving and stouthearted people still cherish their love for freedom; they still yearn for independence, and they are prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice for the attainment of these supreme goals. On the observance of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, we in the free world, in this great habitat of democracy and the home of the free, can do no less, and unfortunately at this time no more, than to echo their genuine sentiment on this memorable occasion.

As I have said in the past, and shall repeat it again, these valiant Lithuanians have never forgotten the sweet taste of freedom. Despite the torture and oppression the Lithuanian people suffer today, we know that their love for liberty is not dimmed and that they have never given up the fight to regain the freedom that was once theirs. Their inhuman oppressors may prevent the Lithuanians from exercising their natural right of freedom, but they cannot force these brave people to accept and believe in the tyranny imposed upon them. The people of Lithuania must know that their countrymen throughout the world, and we in the United States, have not forgotten their plight. In marking this day once more we do not merely recall the dead past. But rather, we reaffirm our faith in this brave country's devotion to liberty and independence and express the hope that the day may soon come when Lithuanians once more may breathe the air of freedom in their beloved and historic homeland.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, nations, like individuals, do not live by bread alone; ideas and ideals often

form an important, and sometimes a crucial part of their fare. Freedom and independence, the liberty to work and enjoy the fruits of one's labor, are perhaps the noblest and ripest of human desires. And national independence is one of the conditions under which individual and group freedom may be attained, for it is almost impossible to conceive of freedom in a land where the people are subjected to the stern regime of alien and unwanted overlords.

Late in the 18th century when the Lithuanians lost their national independence and were brought under the czarist regime of Russia, they lost much of their individual freedoms. For almost a century and a half the stalwart and stouthearted Lithuanians suffered under the brutalities of czarist cruel agents. During that unhappy period they did not lose sight of their objective: the attainment of their independence. In 1918, when that detested regime was overthrown, Lithuanians proclaimed their independence on February 16. That day marks a great turning point in their national history, for from then on a new day had dawned for them. The next two decades were to become a kind of golden age in modern Lithuania. The Lithuanians were justly proud of their splendid record of performance during those two peaceful decades in every walk of their national life. Unfortunately, however, that happy interlude was not to last long. The Second World War was a national tragedy for the Lithuanians. They were one of the first victims of that war as Russian armies moved westward to the Baltic Sea. During that war they suffered much and lost nearly all their worldly possessions, but they still had the hope of regaining their freedom after that war. In that expectation they, as well as their friends, were sadly disappointed. Even before the end of that war the Red army made sure that Lithuania would remain a part of the Soviet Union.

Since 1945 Lithuania has become a large prison camp for its liberty-loving but helpless inhabitants. The country is completely sealed off from the world outside; no one is allowed to leave it, and no one from the free world is allowed to enter it, except the very few who have proved their longstanding sympathy for the Soviet Union and Communist cause. We hear that Lithuanians have been exiled to other parts of the Soviet Union by the tens of thousands, and their place is taken by peoples brought there from Asiatic areas of the Union. All Lithuanians living on the seashore and on border areas have been moved to the interior and have been forced to work in collectivized farms. Of course, they have lost their possessions, and all are in the employ of the state, since the state owns and runs everything in that part of Communist paradise. It is unthinkable to have any freedom under such a system—freedom of speech, of assembly, and of movement is rigidly controlled. The activities of individuals and groups are closely watched, and everyone lives in fear of arrest and imprisonment. Under these conditions, helpless Lithuanians work for their taskmasters and quietly pray for their

deliverance from Communist tyranny. Today, on this anniversary celebration, I gladly join hands with all loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent and express my heartfelt wish to see their freedom.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanians all over the world are marking this day as an anniversary of their independence. As we all are well aware, the observance is ironically symbolic. Since 1944 Lithuania has been in the grip of Soviet domination. We in the United States have never recognized the demise of the legitimate Lithuanian Government, and, we hope that by doing so the enslaved Lithuanian people know that Americans feel and understand their plight. With each passing day we understand more the threat of Soviet despotism. The love of freedom and the will to resist oppression never die in the hearts of men. No people have demonstrated this fact more effectively than the Lithuanians. It is for this reason that I feel honored to join my fellow Americans in commemoration of the brave spirit and hopes of the Lithuanian people on this 41st anniversary of their independence.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary date in the history of Lithuania, we in America express anew our hopes and prayers for the return of her independence. We join with our Lithuanian friends in commemorating that day 41 years ago when the brave people in their homeland briefly won victory in their long struggle for liberty. Today, Communist tyranny casts its dark and ugly shadow over that small country, but through this darkness glows the light of freedom which is nurtured and so cherished in the hearts of these valiant people. By our words and work for freedom throughout the world, we will continue to give them hope and courage until once again they shall be free and independent.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Lithuania observe the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania on February 16, 1918.

There can, of course, be no public celebration of this event within Lithuania which is now under the cruel domination of Soviet Russia. But the love of freedom is a flame within the hearts of the Lithuanian people, and it will continue to burn bright until the day of Lithuanian liberation arrives.

In the United States of America we believe that freedom is everybody's business, and we feel a deep and personal concern for all people who are held in bondage by Communist tyranny.

On this anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, the American people join with the people of Lithuania and those of Lithuanian ancestry in fervent prayer that the Russian yoke will be thrown off, and that the brave and courageous people of Lithuania may soon receive the blessings of freedom and personal liberty.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, another year has rolled around and again we, here in the Congress, are privileged to offer our good wishes to Lithuania and Lithuanians on the occasion of her 41st anniversary of independence.

To a nation which has stood for so long with patience, perseverance and courage, the pain of oppression, it seems so very little that we here in the United States can only by words commemorate this significant occasion.

With my prayers and good wishes goes the hope that Lithuania on her next anniversary will enjoy with us the incomparable blessings of freedom.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is the independence day of Lithuania. This year, however, on the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of its independence, Lithuania no longer enjoys her freedom. On the eve of World War II she became the victim of Soviet conspiracy and aggression.

The dream of Xerxes to "extend the Persian territory as far as God's heaven reaches," where "the sun will then shine on no land beyond our borders," has been revived by the Communist leaders in the 20th century. World revolution, the world domination, have always fascinated them. Convinced that World War II would bring victory for the Communist revolution, the Soviet Union opened the gates of aggression in Europe by becoming a party to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, signed on August 23, 1939. By the terms of this pact, the Soviet Union and Germany divided Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union receiving eastern Poland, Latvia, and Estonia, and later, through an additional secret protocol signed on September 23, 1939, bringing Lithuania into her sphere of influence. All that happened later—the forced conclusion of mutual assistance pacts between the Soviet Union and the Baltic States, military occupation, formation of puppet governments, mock elections—all this was nothing but a history of enslavement for Lithuania and the other Baltic States, notwithstanding the most solemn pledges on the part of the Soviets to respect their territorial integrity and political independence and to abstain from any act of aggression—"No political, military, economic, or other consideration may serve as an excuse or justification for aggression"—treaty on the definition of aggression of July 23, 1933.

As we have seen, the occupation and incorporation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States in 1940 was only a prelude to further territorial acquisitions in Europe and Asia. In Europe alone some hundred million people, citizens of formerly independent nations, were compelled to accept the Soviet rule and forced to work for the strengthening of the Soviet Union.

The same striving for world domination and expansion was expressed by Khrushchev at the 20th Communist Party Congress:

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union follows Lenin's thesis that "all nations will realize socialism, this is inevitable, but not all of them in the same way."

And Khrushchev added:

These [the bourgeois or capitalist] politicians do not dare to declare that capitalism will perish in the new world war, if they wage it, but they are already forced to admit that the Socialist camp is invincible.

Soviet expansion in Europe and Asia was carried out with the greatest ruthlessness, and has been accompanied by the most appalling misery:

In the Soviet sector of the world from the Elbe to China, the pattern of people's democracy brought the blessing of suppression of freedom of opinion, secret police, torture, miscarriage of justice, deportation, and forced labor camps to millions of hungry and war-weary people (Georg Schwarzenberger, "Power Politics," New York, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1951, pp. 633-634).

Although this picture is well known to all students of Soviet policy, nevertheless it seems well to remind everyone of these events, and on this occasion in particular, of the fate of Lithuania, especially now that the Soviet Union is engaged in a feverish campaign for, among other things, peaceful coexistence.

After the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, the Soviets tried to justify this action on several grounds. They advanced the thesis that the Soviet Union was forced to issue ultimatums to the Baltic countries because these countries did not observe the conditions of peaceful coexistence. In the pamphlet "The Soviet Union, Finland and the Baltic States," published by Soviet War News on behalf of the Soviet Information Bureau, in 1941, this thesis was stated as follows:

The Soviet Government considered that the Baltic States were in duty bound to fulfill only one condition necessary for peaceful coexistence. This condition was loyalty and readiness (and this not only in words but in deeds) on the part of the Baltic States not to violate the security of the Soviet Union, not to transform their territory into places d'armes for possible attacks on the Soviet Union, not to permit any country to establish a protectorate over themselves, not to give their territory "on lease" for its possible use by any aggressor or would-be aggressor against the Soviet Union (p. 3).

According to this pamphlet, the Baltic countries did not meet these conditions:

But both the foreign and home policy pursued by the governments of the Baltic States during the whole of the period under review, not only demonstrated their hostility to the Soviet Republic, but systematically violated precisely the one essential condition for peaceful, good-neighborly coexistence—the condition which, had it been respected, would have formed a real basis for their independence and self-determination and the maintenance of peace (pp. 31-32).

Therefore, it was concluded that:

The Soviet Union could not but draw the only possible deduction from all these facts, and in 1940 it was constrained to demand that there should be a change in the Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—since their hostility toward the U.S.S.R. threatened the complete subordination of the Baltic States to German fascism (p. 32).

As a matter of fact, it was the Soviet Union that established a protectorate in the Baltic countries, and transformed them into a place d'armes for the further expansion. It was the Soviet Union that concluded the pact with Nazi Germany and appropriated the Baltic States as her zone of influence. It was the Soviet Union that imposed on the Baltic States the pacts of mutual assistance and established military bases there. It

was the Soviet Union that forced the Baltic countries to turn over their territories "on lease" to the Soviet Union. At the time the Soviet Union presented its charges in ultimatums to the Baltic countries, she had in these countries at least 50,000 to 60,000 troops. Thus, the so-called peaceful coexistence imposed upon the Baltic countries on Soviet terms led finally to the enslavement of Lithuania and the other Baltic countries.

International obligations, according to the Soviet doctrine, have only a limited validity for the Soviet Union, because the Soviet Union claims to be the only competent interpreter in matters of peace, equality, justice, and independence, and, therefore, it is the only state which has the right to reject or modify the existing rules of international law and its obligations. In 1940 Lithuania became victim of this same unilateral concept of international obligations. And this attitude toward international obligations remains unchanged today. There are no signs that the Soviet Union is ready to redress her injustices, and to adopt, in her relations with other countries, an approach which would correspond to the rules adopted by civilized nations, referred to by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles when speaking of Soviet actions in the Baltic States on July 23, 1940:

The policy of this government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried out by the use of force or by threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.

International law is built upon the principle *pacta sunt servanda*. Coexistence at least implies respect of mutual obligations. The respect for promises is the basic principle of mutual understanding and constitutes the foundation of the international community. Analysis of the Soviet practice shows the lack even of such intentions on the part of the Soviet Union. Subjugation of Lithuania under the false pretext that Lithuania did not observe conditions of peaceful coexistence is the best example of disrespect of international obligations.

The Soviet Union, as a member of the United Nations, has the duty "to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the international obligations arising from the treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained"—preamble to the Charter of the United Nations.

Each member of the United Nations, the United States included, has not only the right, but also the duty, to require that international obligations be observed by the members of the United Nations, and that the wrongs committed by the Soviet Union in general, and

against Lithuania in particular, be redressed.

Lithuania is an old nation in the European community. She has a long history, going far back to the 12th and 13th centuries. Lithuanian rights to national independence and statehood rest, apart from the generally accepted right of self-determination, upon her record of 800 years' existence as a nation-state. The services which Lithuania has rendered to the international community are very great, especially during the Middle Ages. And, again in the words of Sumner Welles:

The people of the United States have watched their (the Baltic States) admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

All efforts must be made toward the reestablishment of sovereign rights in this once independent and friendly nation.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the annual observance of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence declared on February 16, 1918, is a good time for all Americans to pause and reflect on the problems of the Lithuanians and other captive peoples suffering under the oppressive rule of the Soviet Union. Lithuania fell prey to the superior force of the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940, so that any celebration of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence is marked by sorrow at the plight of the freedom-loving Lithuanian people.

The Lithuanians have been held in effective slavery and deprived of their human and property rights since 1940. The Soviet Union forced upon the people an illegal puppet government and fraudulently annexed Lithuania in direct violation of their Mutual Assistance Treaty of October 10, 1939 and the earlier nonaggression and peace treaties of July 12, 1920 and September 28, 1926. The Lithuanian people have been subjected to a Soviet plan of genocide which aims to eradicate the Lithuanian national conscience. Over 500,000 Lithuanians have been deported to Siberia or murdered by the Soviets. Soviet and other Communist people have been moved into Lithuania. The political freedoms and economic initiative of those remaining have been destroyed. The Iron Curtain has hidden the full story of the suffering of these brave people.

The plight of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors was heedlessly overlooked in the confusion of World War II. However, the free nations of the world are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of this valiant country that has fought and struggled against tyranny for over a century and a quarter. The tragedy of Lithuania should serve as a reminder to all the free peoples of the world of the danger of Communist aggression. This annual commemoration of the proclamation of Lithuanian independence should serve to remind us that all freedom-loving people must stand resolute in their fight against communism and unite against the forces of evil.

Lithuania has a proud heritage and was a stronghold of Western European civilization in the 13th and 16th cen-

turies. From 1918 until invaded again at the beginning of World War II by first Nazi Germany and then by the Red army, Lithuania was a model republic and made great strides economically and politically which gained the highest respect of all as a wonderful example of self-government.

All of us who hold the cause of freedom precious should do all we can to help Lithuania regain her independence. We can help them during this period when there is little they can do for themselves, by continuing to bring them hope through the Voice of America and other available means, by helping her displaced people find asylum in the United States, by continuing to condemn Soviet aggression in the Baltic States, and the enslavement of free peoples by force, by fraudulently annexing Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia.

This is the time when fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent are rededicating themselves to the cause of freedom and are helping to keep alive the great cultural heritage of Lithuania for their homeland which is now silenced under the heel of the Soviet Union. Let us join with them in the cause for independence for Lithuania and all the captive nations of the world with a message of hope and courage until Lithuania can again take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Lithuanian American Council, representing the majority of nearly 1 million Lithuanian Americans, for its service in helping to strengthen the hope of freedom in the hearts of all Lithuanians.

On the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence of the Lithuanian state, we can appreciate the words of Milton that "None can love freedom heartily but good men." Certainly this history of the Lithuanian state from its beginning in the 11th century to its forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union during our generation shows a people with the flame of freedom in their souls and a light of knowledge in their eyes. Their actions between the two World Wars as leaders in the fight for peace and the struggle for progress helped achieve many fine accomplishments during those years.

It is fortunate that the United States has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. For, in the present world situation, it is to our advantage to have the friendship and cooperation of the Lithuanian people in our quest for world peace and security.

The persecution and tyranny which the Lithuanians are presently undergoing are, I know, a suffering at this time. I hope sincerely that soon it will be possible to see the restoration of Lithuania to independence and freedom.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, once again we are reminded of an historical event of great significance which took place over 40 years ago. On February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed its national independence. In the ensuing years from 1918 to 1940, her valiant people made tremendous strides forward in the economic and social revival of their country

after more than 100 years of tyrannical Russian rule. As a member of the League of Nations, the Republic of Lithuania dedicated itself to democratic principles and gave ample demonstration that it is fully deserving of membership in the family of free nations of the world. Soviet Russian forces succeeded in placing Lithuania in bondage again in 1940. Short-lived though open enjoyment of her independence was, Lithuania's spirit of freedom is today as strong and unconquerable as it ever was.

Compared to the great heroism and courage of the people of Lithuania, despite 18 years of Soviet despotism, brutality, and culture strangling, it is a small thing we do to take a moment on this day to commemorate their independence and assure them of our own unwavering faith in the ultimate triumph of that independence.

Lithuanians are not today the masters of their soil, but, most importantly, they remain the undisputed masters of their own free souls. It is a privilege to join in this fitting tribute to them.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join other colleagues of mine in the House today to pay tribute to the Republic of Lithuania on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the restoration of her independence. Like her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, the peoples of Lithuania have now been under totalitarian rule, either Nazi or Communist, ever since 1940. The meager information that we receive in the free world nevertheless bears every evidence that the spirit of freedom burns as brightly in Lithuania as it did on that memorable day 41 years ago when Lithuania became again a free nation.

The restoration of Lithuania's independence in 1918 followed many years of brutal enslavement and occupation by foreign powers. The fact that the spirit of Lithuanian freedom remained alive during all that time is a heartening proof that Lithuanians, even though in chains, never lost their desire for the God-given rights of independence and self-determination. I hope and trust it will encourage them in their struggle against Communist tyranny to know that our own country and indeed the peoples of the entire free world are with them in their fight for freedom and that we all believe that liberation from foreign enslavement will again come to Lithuania as well as the other corresponding nations and peoples now in the grip of international Communists. By continuing to recognize Lithuania as a sovereign state, our Government has given yet another proof of the fact that it is not prepared to acquiesce in totalitarian conquests in defiance of international commitments and the moral principles that should be common to all mankind.

It is my pleasure to salute the people of Lithuania on this memorable anniversary as well as to pay tribute to the thousands of American citizens of Lithuanian origin who are personally determined to do all in their power to restore freedom to their homeland. In this memorable cause the work of the Lithuanian American Council and the Lithuanian American Information Center are worthy of particular note. I am glad to

join my other colleagues in Congress in extending our greetings at this time and to pledge our continued efforts to do all in our power to insure that the sacrifices which have been made in the name of Lithuanian independence shall not have been in vain.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence after many years of annexation to the Russian Empire. The United States was one of the first countries to recognize the Lithuanian independence. I am honored and proud today to join my colleagues in the House in celebrating this 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian independence.

To these friends of ours this day will be a day of dedication to the past, to the memory of the brave people of Lithuania who have remained unsubdued in spirit even though imprisoned by Soviet tyranny.

The present situation in Lithuania is of grave concern to Lithuanian Americans, the majority of whom have kin-folks in the old country. Lithuania is a veritable prison. Few people are permitted to leave the country and visitors are not allowed; thousands of her sons and daughters have been murdered through political execution, planned starvation and exile to death camps; deportations have scattered other thousands throughout the vast Soviet empire; her people are forced to go to the Soviet Union, as "volunteer laborers."

Nevertheless, the memory of liberty survives in Lithuania. The theory that Lithuania or any other comparative nation of central Europe rejoices in their slavery to Moscow fools nobody and silences nobody who does not have to live under Russian bayonets.

Such a nation is Lithuania and such people are entitled, not only to our sympathy and our moral support, but to our active, effective assistance in forwarding their high aims for the recapture of their liberties and the reestablishment of their sovereignty.

Our own great Nation must make it abundantly clear to all other nations that we stand for liberalization from tyranny and oppression and for self-determination and freedom of choice for all people to ordain and to establish their own form of government under democratic processes.

The enslavement of Lithuania is one of the worst crimes of the Soviet Union. God grant that deliverance may come soon.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues and friends of Lithuania in paying tribute to the courageous people of that land. All of America is richer for the contributions men and women of Lithuanian descent have made to our national strength and cultural heritage.

It is well that we who have met here today interrupt our usual routine and applaud the Lithuanian determination to be free and salute those who have kept that spark of freedom alive. All Americans are indebted to their persistent efforts which have refused to let us forget that the spirit of democracy needs periodic refreshing. Too often we are inclined to take freedom and equal

opportunities for granted, as being as natural as the air we breathe, forgetting the struggle of our forefathers to obtain it and unmindful of those around us who have never enjoyed the privilege.

The annual anniversary celebration of Lithuanian independence with its rededication to the principles of tolerance, liberty, of basic human rights, for human dignity, for the freedom of the press and religion rekindles the eternal spark of universal freedom now threatened with suffocation in many parts of the world. Would that the echo of our voices from this Hall supporting Lithuanian aspirations and objectives resound throughout the world.

Ultimately, we believe all voices of peoples desiring freedom will coalesce into a thundering sound and the full force of their determination will tumble the pillars of dictatorial structures.

In this swiftly revolving world of power politics and economic change no nation, not even Russia, can hold out indefinitely against the forces of justice and equality. In the new world which must be born if we are to live in this space age among our nuclear gadgets and weapons, the zigzag history of Lithuanian freedom is destined to join others in a broad and uninterrupted channel of progressive evolution spanning a sea of harmony and peace and good will and the brotherhood of man.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Lithuanian people upon the 41st anniversary of their independence.

Fate is not expected to be kind to all peoples and nations. Some have been more fortunate in possessing the requisite power, and also the luck, to shape their own destiny. Others, particularly the small nations, lacking the power for the mastery of their future and finding that they are not among the lucky ones, have often been victims of some untoward events or have suffered under other powerful nations. The Lithuanians have been among the unlucky ones.

This unfortunate but gallant nation has had its glories in a distant past, but since the late 18th century its destiny was in the hands of Russia's autocratic czars. In 1917, as the result of the Russian revolution, when that wretched regime was overthrown, Lithuanians had the chance of realizing their centuries-old dream. They proclaimed their independence and established their own democratic form of government. Amid multiple handicaps and hardships, they worked their way out of misery and chaos. Their independence was recognized by other sovereign nations; Lithuania was admitted into the League of Nations, and thus once again she joined the community of nations.

For about two decades, during the interwar years, hardworking, industrious, sturdy, and tenacious Lithuanians rebuilt their war-torn, ruined country. In time it became one of the most prosperous and progressive democracies in that part of Europe. And the people enjoyed their freedom to the full. But the turn of international events over which they had no control threatened

their independence, even their very existence. In 1940 their worst apprehensions were justified, when they were forced to agree to have Red army forces stationed in their country. In mid-June of that same year Red forces occupied the whole country. They established their own type of government which immediately "asked" that the country be incorporated into the Soviet Union. That was done on July 21, 1940. Thus came the end of free and independent Lithuania.

During the last war Lithuanians changed their unwanted masters more than once; for more than 2 years the country was held under Nazi occupation. Toward the end of the war the Nazis were evicted and their place was once more taken by Communist Russians. And they have been there ever since. Today they rule over Lithuania with an iron hand, inflexible in its ruthlessness and cruel efficiency. Gone are the days of freedom and democracy. There is no freedom of movement, of speech, and of expression. Every act of the Lithuanian citizen is formulated and dictated by the minions of the Kremlin, and their orders are carried out irrespective of the human and material costs. Today Lithuanians in their homeland live in a large prison camp, and they all pray for deliverance and freedom.

On this 41st anniversary of their Independence Day, they have our heartfelt sympathy. Although we in the free world cannot do much for them immediately, yet we can pay tribute to their courage and their energy. Those of Lithuanian descent, and they are well represented in my Third Congressional District, are honorable representatives of their ancestral home. By their qualities they enrich our Nation's life as our Nation provides them with opportunities for fruitful work. We salute the people of Lithuania on the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, for a number of reasons it is appropriate for us in the United States to share in the celebration of the anniversary of the restoration of Lithuanian independence. That day in February 41 years ago when the voice of Lithuania was heard throughout the world announcing its freedom from Russian bondage was one of the milestones in the age-old struggle of the forces of liberty against the tyranny of might. It was a milestone for age-old Lithuania, and a milestone in the political evolution of civilized people.

The Lithuania of 1918 was one of the countries which emerged in response to the Wilsonian demand for the self-determination of peoples. When President Wilson influenced the political contours of the map of Europe, after World War I, he was but voicing the sentiment of the people of the United States, since their emergence as a nation, in favor of the idea that all men should have a voice in the settlement of their own political status, in the right of a homogeneous population to determine the form of government under which their territory should be governed. This principle we in the United States believe in; and the spirit which persists in this thought we honor.

The Lithuanian people of yesterday and of today have maintained their belief in the right of men to be free—to be independent politically, socially, culturally. When in 1918 this belief came to fruition, the emergence of Lithuania was a reemergence. It was not only the birth of their nation for the then current generation; it was a rebirth of the Lithuania of old. For Lithuania was already at least as old as the Christian era. Since Tacitus in the first century A.D. first made mention of the name Lithuania, that name had appeared and reappeared as an entity down the centuries of European history.

The language of Lithuania bears witness to this fact. This language, like no other in Europe, excepting only that of the Basques, had preserved the marks of antiquity in remarkable purity. It has been the mark of a people who have maintained their independence throughout the vicissitudes of almost 2,000 years of rugged history. Despite the smallness of the group, despite the buffetings of a bitter fate, this tiny cluster of homogeneous folk tossed about among its neighboring colossi—by the barbaric hordes in the Middle Ages, by the ransacking armies of modern history—despite all the power against them, the Lithuanians have remained a people unto themselves.

Battling the Russians independently in the 11th century, resisting Germans, Poles, and Russians in the 13th, merging with the Poles—politically—for the next six centuries, only to be dominated with them again and again by Russia, these brave and hardy people nevertheless kept their personality, their individuality. Lithuania was able to withstand all this and more.

When, in 1918, the independence of the Lithuanian people was restored, it was a marvelous and a memorable event. It was not the less so because it was to be short lived. Germans and Russians were to battle again over this little country in World War II; and again Russia—Soviet Russia—was to dominate it politically. The spirit of Lithuania has never been dominated. The personality of the Lithuanian people was to endure as it had endured down through the ages. The many-faceted contributions of the Lithuanians to society, to the development of civilization, in Europe and in America, have a distinct place in the greater than their persistence in the annals of the centuries. None has been pendence.

It is gratifying to take part in a celebration of significance to free men everywhere. We salute Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1959, marks the 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania.

The Iron Curtain has dropped upon the good people of Lithuania, but no Iron Curtain can extinguish the love of liberty which was so brilliantly established 41 years ago. The voices of liberty can be stilled, but only for a little while, because the history of mankind again and again has proven that those who have once tasted of liberty can never again relinquish it forever.

The dream of liberty in its essence is a faith that cannot and will not be denied, a faith in the goodness of mankind, a faith based upon individual responsibility. All this is brought to consciousness on the commemorative date of February 16.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting on this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence that all Americans pay tribute to freedom-loving Lithuanians everywhere and to their country. In commemorating this day we honor Lithuania—small in size but great in spirit.

Since the 13th century, Lithuania has enjoyed periods of liberty and self-government but has also been the victim of attack and domination. Yet it has maintained its spirit and belief in the dignity of human liberty and has continued to fight for freedom. The First World War brought a new era for the courageous people of Lithuania. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence. During the following two decades this democratic republic made rapid progress as a proud member of the community of nations.

Unfortunately, World War II marked the end of liberty for Lithuania. Once again she was engulfed and her freedom extinguished. In 1940, Lithuania was seized by Russia, this time to fall under the domination of communism. Her people have suffered shameful persecutions and hardships at the hands of the Communists and yet they continue to resist this tyranny, and work for the day when they will again be free.

The people of Lithuania are dedicated to the principle of individual liberty and national independence; they have staunchly maintained their national identity in spite of their long-term enslavement. We are confident that the Lithuanian people will never cease in their efforts to gain liberty. Their faith has emerged triumphantly in the past and will do so in the future.

We proudly join our fellow Americans of Lithuanian descent and freedom-loving people everywhere in offering tribute to and prayers for a valiant people, destined to emerge victorious over Communist oppression in enduring independence and in final freedom.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, another anniversary of the independence of the little Baltic Republic of Lithuania—the 41st anniversary in the annals of that captive nation's history—is being observed on February 16. Unfortunately, the people of Lithuania are not free to partake of this event or to commemorate it in freedom.

The hopes and aspirations of the Lithuanian nation, those living under the tyrannous yoke of communism as well as their kinsmen in the free world, have not been erased either by time or by Moscow's deceitful campaigns of smiles or of coexistence. Their faith in God and in the future survival of their people continues to remain strong. They will never abandon their efforts to attain freedom and liberation from communism.

Each year on this occasion they wait for a word of encouragement from us, a word of sympathetic understanding

from the people of the free world, a sign of genuine friendship from freedom-loving people everywhere. It remains for us to help them sustain their faith in God and in humanity, faith in their own inevitable freedom and in their survival. This means a great deal to them in these dark hours of desperation.

May this anniversary of their independence serve as a ray of bright hope to the people of Lithuania and their kinsmen in America. We express our solidarity with them in their holy struggle. Together with them we pray that their ancestral home will once again be a free and independent country in their lifetime.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people lived in their historic homeland on the eastern shores of the Baltic centuries before the discovery of America, and they had constituted their independent state long before the rise of some modern states in Europe. Though they form one of the small European nations, they have made their place secure in the history of Europe by their valorous deeds and glorious accomplishments. During the 14th and 15th centuries they ruled over a great kingdom, one of the strongest in northeastern Europe, and at times were a real force in opposing the Asiatic incursions into Europe. Then for two centuries the kingdom was united with the Kingdom of Poland, and in the 18th century when Poland was partitioned, and a part of it fell to Russia, Lithuania also came under Russian rule. Thus toward the end of that century Lithuania became a province of the Russian Empire, and so it remained until World War I.

Toward the end of that war, when the czarist regime in Russia was shattered, Lithuanians saw the chance of regaining their freedom. On February 16 of 1918 they proclaimed their independence and established a republic. Thenceforth for more than two decades they enjoyed their freedom to the full, and literally recreated their war-ravaged and run-down country. In this relatively short time they made great advances in all phases of their national life, and they were all contented and happy. But as a small nation they were living under apprehensions and fears, always suspecting aggressive designs of their powerful totalitarian neighbors, particularly those of the Soviet Union. Unfortunately their worst fears found justification. Soon after the outbreak of the last war the Red army treacherously marched into the country, occupied it, and in July it was made part of the Soviet Union.

Since those days poor Lithuanians have not known freedom. In their homeland, with many thousands driven to various parts of the Soviet empire, they have been leading the life of imprisoned slave laborers. Their country still remains under the heels of Russian Communists, and there they are bottled up behind the Iron Curtain; none is allowed to move out and no one from the free world is permitted to visit. They are all forced to work and produce for their hard taskmasters, and of course they enjoy none of the freedoms which

we regard in the free world as our birthright. They cannot and are not allowed to celebrate their national independence day. But we in the free world, in observing the 41st anniversary of that historic event, gladly echo their patriotic and fine sentiments, and hope that someday they will be free to do the same in their homeland.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Lithuanian people. I am proud and eager to associate myself with the other Members of the House in calling this event to the attention of the American people.

A glance at the history of Lithuania reveals a gallant people, industrious and freedom loving. The country suffered for 123 years under czarist Russia. The independence declared in 1918 was lost again to Communist Russia in 1940.

Our own American history pays tribute to the Lithuanians who helped tame our frontiers and who now constitute a valuable element of America. These Lithuanian-Americans pause today and join with all free people in celebrating the tragically brief independence of valiant Lithuania. The little Baltic State itself is deprived of being able to celebrate; indeed there is little to celebrate for Russian domination has abrogated all the joys of freedom. To the Lithuanians, February 16 is a reminder of a glorious goal they hope to regain, and a reminder of the oath they cherish to overthrow the alien elements who are suppressing their liberty.

On this occasion of the 41st Anniversary of Lithuania's National Independence, I want to remind Lithuanians and Americans alike that the United States has never recognized the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States. But we do realize the presence of an unwelcome intruder who has enslaved the country. We realize, also, that this enslavement is doomed as long as the will for freedom and independence exists in the heart of Lithuania.

We, in America, led by the loyal Lithuanian-Americans, commemorate not only the proclamation of Lithuania's independence but also the spirit prevailing today in that country which assures us that independence will be reborn.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, revolutions cause death to innocent peoples and untold amount of unnecessary destruction; in this respect they are like wars. The Russian revolution of 1917 seemed, at least at the time, to usher in a new era not only for the Russians, but also for numerous ethnic groups in the czarist empire. Many hitherto suppressed nationalities found their salvation in that revolution, and many of them proclaimed their independence soon after that world-rocking event. The Lithuanian independence was thus a child of the Russian revolution of 1917.

Since the late 18th century, Lithuania had become part of czarist Russia and for more than 100 years Lithuanians had to endure the oppressive yoke of Russia's stern and autocratic regime. The czar's callous and cruel officials during that long period did all in their

power to eradicate and uproot all signs and symbols of Lithuanian nationalism. All national celebrations were tabooed and proscribed; the study and use of the Lithuanian language was discouraged; the show of Lithuanian national traits and feelings were regarded with suspicion, and those displaying any sign of independence were closely watched, and faced imprisonment. Yet despite these stern and strict measures the Lithuanians retained their sense of nationality. They venerated their national traditions, clung steadfastly to their ideals, and longed for their national independence. The Russian Revolution of 1917 offered them the opportunity to attain their national political independence.

On February 16, 41 years ago, Lithuanians regained their freedom and proclaimed their independence. In the enjoyment of that freedom they worked ceaselessly and tirelessly, and in the course of two decades, during the interwar years, they rebuilt their war-ravaged country as a model of prosperous and progressive democracy. Then came the Second World War, which in the course of its first year swallowed independent Lithuania and made it, much against the wishes of the helpless Lithuanians, part of the Soviet Union.

Since 1940, except for the 2-year period during the war, the unfortunate Lithuanians have been oppressed by the tyrannical government imposed upon them by the Communist rulers of the Kremlin. There they suffer in misery and under conditions approaching servitude beneath the heel of their detested and despised overlords. At the same time, in their hearts they all cherish the hope that someday, somehow, freedom and independence may dawn over their heads in their historic and beloved homeland. I am glad to join loyal and liberty-loving and proud Americans of Lithuanian descent who, in observing the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, echo the true feelings and sentiments of oppressed Lithuanians in unfree Lithuania.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania, with the poisoned fangs of communism penetrating her national heart, celebrates the memory of her 41st anniversary of the independence proclamation, now physically dead nearly 19 years.

Lithuania can, with fervent prayers, thank God for the undying friendship of America. The United States has never given its approval, or given official recognition, of the illegal seizure of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanian people were an independent nation 400 years before the discovery of America. Her culture and spiritual contributions to Christianity are the legends of antiquity. Although she is no longer free, her sacrifices and prayerful yearning to regain what was lost before—in 1795—and regained on February 16, 1918, when a number of small nations were restored their independence and freedom, Lithuania lived again as a sovereign nation.

And 19 years ago Lithuania fell again, under the lash of the Russian hordes, and

now lies oppressed; on the pages of history, written by great nations without conscience, and steeped in the blood of the patriots of the underground, who ever keep the vigil, sparking freedom's holy light since the June 15, 1940, slaughter.

Lithuania awaits its chance. This brave race, cultured in the glory of their great tradition of freedom, dating before the Christian era, steeled to tolerance and suffering, awaits with prayers and courage the day ending Soviet slavery, tyranny, and domination.

America will break the illegal seizure of these little nations throughout Europe and the Baltic area. These nations will be rescued from enslavement by the repudiation of the Russian lie against Christianity. It will be an internal eruption, and upon that day we must stand by our friends, who have struggled for the same freedoms as those of the liberty-loving Americans.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of a glorious step in mankind's march for full liberty and freedom.

It was on February 16, 1918, that the people of Lithuania proclaimed their independence and announced the birth of the Republic of Lithuania.

This new Republic, whose history as a nation traces back through many centuries, grew and thrived. It held an honored place in the community of nations. But World War II brought this valiant country again under a new Russian oppression, and in 1940 the Soviet Union, in violation of all laws of man and morality, made Lithuania a part of Soviet Russia.

In the years since 1940, heroic Lithuania has been under Communist dictatorship. Many of its people, we are reliably informed, have been deported from their homeland to work as slave laborers in Siberia.

But still the burning hope of freedom glows bright in the hearts of the Lithuanian people. And today, on Lithuanian Independence Day, the prayers of millions of men, women, and children of Lithuanian ancestry are rising heavenward—prayers that one day in the not too distant future the Republic of Lithuania will stand again as a free and independent nation.

We, in Connecticut, are proud of the great contributions made to our State by sons and daughters of Lithuania. We join our prayers with theirs on this day.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today is a day of both joy and sorrow for the people of Lithuania. Since the 16th century Lithuanians have known a short 42 years of freedom. This small but intensely proud nation has been buffeted about by Russia, Germany, and Poland during almost the entire span of modern history, yet their desire for national identity has never wavered.

As illustrative of this fact, immediately after World War I, in the midst of the Russian revolution, the Lithuanian people proclaimed their independence. This act was based on the precepts of President Wilson's 14 points. The state of Lithuania was recognized by the rest of the world as a sovereign sister of the in-

ternational community of nations. In all too short a time the terror of World War II befell our world. After 2 crushing years of Nazi occupation the hope of freedom regained burst forth in the minds and hearts of Lithuanians everywhere. The hope was ruthlessly smothered by the Soviet Union. For all practical purposes Lithuania is now a part of the U.S.S.R., her Government under the shadow of the hammer and sickle.

It is significant that we in the United States have never recognized this Soviet domination on any diplomatic level. The position of Lithuania must change of necessity. The hearts and minds of the Lithuanian people demand freedom. The Soviet rule by terror cannot relax its grip on a people that make this demand.

There are many men and women of Lithuanian descent here in the United States. They have added to the strength, diversity, and culture of our land. For all that Lithuania stands for, it is with pleasure that I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to these courageous people. True, it is a solemn tribute, for there is much to overcome before the reality of freedom can live in Lithuania again. The spirit of freedom is indomitable; Lithuania will be free.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the gallant Lithuanian nation on the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the independence of that country.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania declared her independence to the entire world. Today Lithuania is not free for, in June 1940, her lands and institutions were unjustly seized by Soviet Russia and to this date her people have been undergoing persecution and tyranny.

My experience on the special Katyn Massacre Committee and, subsequently, on the Kersten Committee on Communist Aggression, a few years ago, has given me access to facts which give astounding testimony to the great love for liberty and freedom of the Lithuanian people, and of their brave resistance to Communist aggression.

Those who still believe in the possibility of peaceful coexistence with brutal Communist tyranny, and with a regime which has no respect for solemn agreements, should read carefully the testimony and evidence submitted to the congressional Committee on Communist Aggression. They will learn that the occupation of Lithuania by the Communists began with a peaceful coexistence which soon was replaced by armed occupation, murders, and mass deportations.

On this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, let us remind ourselves of the fact that freedom-loving peoples throughout the world have the God-given right to be free, and that no one may deprive them of that right.

Let us look realistically upon the situation as it exists today. Appeasement and acts of weakness on our part can only bring closer to our doors the menace of Communist occupation as it is known today in Lithuania.

I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the gallant Lithuanian na-

tion and pray that we may have the wisdom and courage to face the future with faith and confidence in our ideals and in our way of life.

I express the hope that, through Divine Providence, the day is not too far distant that the Lithuanian people and all others now under the domination of Communist regimes will again enjoy the freedom that they so deeply desire and which is so close to their hearts.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Independence Day is an occasion for celebration wherever Lithuanians are gathered together in the free world. Here in the United States we join gladly in honoring a people whose perseverance, whose love of liberty, and whose hardihood of character have withstood the grimmest tests of fate. Lithuania has known the most severe and prolonged eras of political misfortune that any country in Europe has had to endure. Yet the Lithuanian character has emerged practically intact.

Although the Lithuania which we honor on this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day was by some counts a country young in the annals of modern states, it was in actuality old in history—older than any other part of Europe, in fact, or at least as old as any; for only the Basques can boast as ancient a lineage. The purity of the Lithuanian language bears witness to the enduring qualities of a people whom we find being mentioned by Tacitus, in the 1st century A.D.; whom we find in the 20th century maintaining a purity of character and of culture never dissolved, in spite of hundreds of years of political subjugation.

Lithuania emerged as a state at various intervals during the intervening centuries. It emerged only to be swallowed up again by its mighty neighbors. But it was never absorbed.

These emergings, these periods of political independence were the outbursts of a spirit which has endured through all the vicissitudes of the centuries. The Lithuanians have exhibited a hardihood, a solidarity, and a determination to retain their independence of spirit, of character, and of culture, such as have few people on this earth.

Because of these indomitable marks of distinction, the Lithuanian people have made distinct and valuable contributions to the society in which they find themselves. We in the United States have benefited from their settlements among us. Their music, their art, their industry, their charity, and their loyalty to their own have bettered the communities where they are. Above all, their independence of spirit is the hallmark which we recognize in joining in the celebration of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, once again it is my privilege to join with my colleagues here on the floor of the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the valiant nation of Lithuania which today should be celebrating the anniversary of its independence. As we all know Lithuania proclaimed her independence on February 16, 1918. Unfortunately, that independence was shortlived. The

tragic story of the brutal assault of this noble and courageous nation by Soviet Russia has been repeated many times.

As I indicated a year ago on this same occasion, it is a sobering thought to realize that for the people of Lithuania this day cannot be other than a day of sadness. We in America, who so rightly cherish our own Independence Day, can well understand the feeling of sorrow that all Americans of Lithuanian ancestry must have at the realization that that great nation has been denied the very right to exist under a government of its own choosing.

The contribution of the Lithuanians in America and their descendants gives us some idea of the national vitality of that country. It is an indication that confidence and faith in Lithuania's future is well placed. The regime imposed on Lithuania has violated everything which free men hold dear. That it has not been completely successful in its endeavor is due only to the strong inborn love the Lithuanian people have for the cherished principles of freedom and liberty. These principles are the same elements of moral law which we Americans hold in such high esteem and which have guided our great country from its inception. To be true to ourselves, we must, of necessity, be true to valiant Lithuania. It must be our solemn pledge that we shall never compromise those principles and that we shall not rest until Lithuania is free. Let it be our fervent prayer that our sister country soon have the shackles of oppression removed and may God grant that it happen soon.

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in calling to the attention of the House the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

In 1918 after 123 years of Russian rule, Lithuania was proclaimed free. The Lithuanian people achieved independence as the result of a great nationalist political and cultural revival which took place in spite of all previous Russian efforts to obliterate Lithuanian national sentiment.

Lithuania flourished in freedom for an all-too-short 22 years. Then came that tragic day when the Soviet Army swept into that free country, killing hundreds of men, women, and children, exiling the most ardent nationalists to Siberia, and placing both the territory and institutions under Soviet military control.

We of the House of Representatives, speaking in the name of all Americans, pay tribute to the brave citizens of Lithuania, whether they are in Soviet captivity inside Lithuania, whether they are exiled to Siberia, or whether they are now part of the Lithuanian community of America.

We congratulate them for their persistence, for their bravery, and for their high ideals and love of freedom. We join with them in praying that they may see the eventual restoration of Lithuania to the people of Lithuania, and the end of Soviet domination in Eastern Europe.

In the meantime, I urge this body to consider the liberalization of United States immigration laws to permit recent

escapees from communism to emigrate here, and to keep families together.

I urge both the Government and leaders in private industry to assist the intellectuals and aged exiles from Iron Curtain countries to acquire new skills for employment.

I urge all Americans today to join with all people of the world who truly love freedom in sympathizing with the plight of the people who are prohibited from voicing their innate longing for liberty.

Let us work for the day when the Lithuanian people shall again be free to join a world where a desire for peace can be respected and international trust prevail.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the freedom-loving Lithuanians throughout the world, who, on February 16, 1959, will observe the 41st anniversary of their national independence.

The Lithuanians were among the first of many nationality groups who shook off imperial Russia's czarist regime toward the end of the First World War and regained their long-lost independence. Unfortunately, they were also among the first to be robbed of their independence early in the last war by their former oppressors. For more than a century, from late 18th century until 1918, they suffered under the autocratic czarist regime. Their material losses were immense, and physically they suffered hardships and miseries, but spiritually they were unscathed. The unwieldy and inefficient Russian regime could not stamp out the Lithuanian national traits; the czar's agents were incapable of eradicating the spirit of freedom and independence among the Lithuanians. Stoutly and courageously these few million people held their own against the powers of the czars and defied Russian authorities when attempts were made to Russianize them, and submerge them in the one big Russian maelstrom. They were ready to sacrifice all their worldly possessions and, if necessary, submit to imprisonment and exile, but were unwilling to give up their beliefs and their long-cherished national ideals. They clung to them tenaciously and steadfastly, and when the time came to assert their independence they seized upon the occasion and proclaimed the emergence of the Lithuanian Republic. That was done on February 16, 1918, 41 years ago today.

Thereafter for a number of years the people went through indescribable difficulties. The war-ravaged country had to be built, the needy and hungry people had to be fed, and the governmental machinery just instituted had to be put into efficient working order. More important and perhaps most crucial of all was the organization of the country's defense forces for the maintenance of its newly won independence. In time, however, these difficulties were overcome, many problems were solved, and independent Lithuania progressed steadily. She became a member of the League of Nations, and played her part in world affairs honorably and well. In the course of almost two decades she was regarded as a prosperous and progressive country.

But this happy situation did not last long; or, perhaps it is more correct to say, that Lithuania's envious, aggressive and powerful neighbors did not allow it to last long. The deadliest and the most implacable of Lithuania's enemies was the Soviet Union, and the masters of that country saw to it that democratic Lithuania did not remain free and independent. The outbreak of the Second World War foreshadowed the doom of many small independent free states; and Lithuania was no exception. Early in 1940, under some outrageous pretext, Stalin's forces occupied the country, and in July of that year it was annexed to the Soviet Union.

During the war Lithuanians suffered much. Many thousands of them were exiled to various parts of the Soviet Union, and those who were allowed to remain in their homeland were forced to work as slaves for their Communist overlords. When the Nazis occupied the country and held it for about 2 years, the lot of the poor Lithuanian was no better; he had to work hard in Hitler's labor force to keep his fighting machinery going. Then toward the end of that war the Communists returned once more, and this time with more fury and acted more ferociously. Since then the destiny of Lithuania has been wedded to the whims and wiles of the masters in the Kremlin.

Today Lithuania is one large prison camp in which some 3 million innocent and helpless but courageous and liberty-loving people are driven to work under most wretched and unenviable conditions for their Communist bosses. There all worldly possessions are owned and controlled by the Soviet state. They are the slaves of the most totalitarian dictatorship known to man, and the men operating that dictatorial regime have no concern for the welfare and livelihood of their unfortunate subjects. Being sealed off from the outside world, we in the free world know little of their actual status, but what little we know is sad and tragic. They have no freedom of any kind, not even the freedom to celebrate the anniversary of their unforgettable and unforgettable independence day. In this free country, in this hospitable home of true democracy, I join all Americans of Lithuanian descent in the observance of that memorable event, the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania. I would like to join with Americans of Lithuanian ancestry and with freedom loving peoples everywhere in commemorating this important date, and in expressing our deepest sympathy for the present plight of the Lithuanian people.

In spite of the long years of enslavement by the Communists, the Lithuanian people have preserved their strong national feelings and kept alive the will for freedom. The desire for freedom is a powerful spiritual force. The human spirit will survive many hardships, and it can outlast the effect of any weapon of destruction. It is this human spirit

which will decide the winner in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. We must continue to encourage this source of strength by pledging ourselves once again to the task of building a better world in which all nations may live in peace, freedom and justice.

On this 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania, I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in commemorating this date, and in expressing our hope that the Lithuanian nation will once again take its rightful place with the free nations of the world.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on this observance of Lithuanian Independence Day, we remind ourselves and the world of the Treaty of Moscow, signed on July 12, 1920, whereby Soviet Russia recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent State, and renounced forever all her claims to Lithuanian territory.

The subsequent betrayal of that solemn pledge is not surprising. It is characteristic of communism.

Other nations have been betrayed by the conspirators in the Kremlin. The latest victim, Hungary.

Americans, who have had no personal experience with Communist terror and treachery must be warned, again and again, so that our Nation will never enter into any agreement with the Communist world that cannot be enforced.

Lithuania acted in good faith, but that was not enough to protect her sovereignty from the Communists whose ambition is to dominate the world.

The United States has never recognized the brutal annexation of Lithuania and never will. We are happy that, every year, we have this opportunity as Members of Congress who represent the American people, to declare, clearly and firmly, that we will never bargain away the sacred rights of Lithuania, or any other captive nation, in return for Soviet offers to settle other questions.

Moscow, take notes.

We mean every word of our pledge to the people of Lithuania, that we will work unrelentingly for the inevitable liberation of their country.

What is right is right and no amount of Soviet propaganda or power politics can alter the fact that Lithuania was forcibly robbed of her independence. There will never be peace in Europe until her independence, and that of the other captive nations, are restored. Communist Russia must make restitution.

Three million Lithuanians in the homeland pray for that happy day.

In this they are joined by free men everywhere whose conscience will not be satisfied until the Russian occupation forces are withdrawn from that Baltic State never to return.

The faith of the Lithuanian people has proved stronger than the tyrants who come and go.

That faith will be vindicated when Lithuania is free again and forevermore.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that we should pause today to celebrate Lithuanian Independence Day, and once again with grateful hearts pay our sincere tributes to the great and noble Lithuanian people.

Most Americans have their roots somewhere in Europe, and all of us realize the terrible scourge of persecution, cruelty, and oppression that was and is the lot of many peoples behind the Iron Curtain or in so-called satellite lands.

I could recite at length the glorious history of the proud Lithuanian people. I could embellish their virtues, passion for liberty, and willingness to bleed and die for freedom, their unconquerable spirit, impressive culture, and happy family life, their imperishable contributions to free government and inestimable gifts of loyalty and richly constructive citizenship in our own great country.

Many such words will be spoken here and elsewhere today and they will all be so true, so accurate, so well deserved. It is well that these generous words should be spoken to remind the world of the glories of Lithuania and the stalwart, age-old devotion of its people to every good cause.

Commendable, welcome, and fitting as these words of recognition, praise, and eulogy may be, they do not discharge in full measure our obligation to stand by the Lithuanian people and other oppressed peoples. Something more than mere words are needed today; something more than hopes for their liberation and deliverance from tyranny.

What this Congress must do in this day and age is to act in their behalf, in behalf of all the enslaved peoples of the world, to strike out with the energy, influence, and resources we have for the Lithuanians, for the Poles, for the Latvians, for the Rumanians, for the Serbs, for the Hungarians, and Czechs and Slavs, and all those who are beaten down today under the whiplash of the bestial Communist police state.

Let us act at once to sound throughout the world the cry of liberation, the demand for the release of oppressed peoples from abominable slavery. In the midst of all the prattling and the threats that we hear day by day, hour by hour, in propaganda outbursts that the Soviet will wantonly destroy us with its new weapons, this Nation must remain calm, cool, and collected. We are deeply resentful at all the threats, insults, slurs, and derision directed against us.

Let us dispassionately consider the source from which these mockeries come. Let us recognize who and what our enemy is and who means to destroy us. Let us not welcome that enemy here. Let us not hug and embrace him for shooting down our peacebound airmen. Let us cast that enemy from our gates. Let us renounce all his works and soundly and publicly and loudly condemn his evil intentions to conquer mankind and subject everyone in the world to his type of police state, denounce his repeated outrages against international order, honor, and peace.

The time has come for this Nation to stand firm and resolute. We have thoughtlessly taken enough insults. We have listened to enough dire threats. We have been surfeited with enough crude derision. Now let us make it clear to the world that we do not propose to take it any more.

What I propose once again on this great day of Lithuanian independence is the adoption of a strong, affirmative policy that will serve notice to the Soviet and the people of the world just where we stand on these great issues of freedom, human honor and decency and peace. Unless we can get definite assurance that tirades, assaults, abuses, and internal conspiracies against us shall cease, we should seriously consider the early recall of our Ambassador from Moscow and termination of diplomatic relations. At the same time, if we could induce our allies in the free world to take a similar position, it would not be long before the brazen, hostile operations of the Communist conspiracy in the free world would be isolated and confined. This result would be welcomed by free peoples. It would strengthen the free world.

The time has come when we must courageously assume the risk of taking a strong, unyielding position. The risk of a firm policy is less than that of waiting, temporizing, and delaying until the Soviet is prepared to attack. Our foreign policy cannot be based on surrender to blandishments and threats.

The next war may be over in a few days. The winner could well be the one that gets in the first blow. We might be brought to our knees, but the potential enemy would be on his back. If we want to help subject peoples and restore once great nations to their place in the family of nations we must be resolute now. Further delay may be fatal to free government here and throughout the world and to our own survival.

Long live free Lithuania.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, as we commemorate the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, the freedom loving people of that gallant nation and others behind the Iron Curtain are no more free than last year when we marked this day of independence. The 3 million Lithuanians who look to America for leadership in their struggle to regain their independence look in vain—for our foreign policy takes us no closer to peace and the Lithuanian people no closer to freedom.

In Cleveland a large segment of the population is of Lithuanian extraction. They have made a valuable contribution to the civic life of our community. In their diligent work and provident thrift, in their respect for the Constitution and the laws of our community, they are exemplary citizens. They have always been proud of their culture and heritage. They have always been concerned with the welfare of their less fortunate families and friends who remained in Lithuania.

Their friends and neighbors in Cleveland are grateful for this tremendous contribution and they share their concern over families and loved ones left behind. On this day we reaffirm our pledge to Lithuanians and to all oppressed people that we shall not relent in our efforts to keep alive the spirit of true freedom and to achieve individual dignity for man everywhere.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day we pay homage to the

courageous people of Lithuania, who have kept alive the flame of liberty despite two decades of subjugation and oppression. The Lithuania of the 20th century took its place among the nations on February 16, 1918, when the people proclaimed their independence.

For more than a century they had been occupied by Russia, and after World War I were able to announce the fruition of an age-old dream.

In a historical sense, Lithuania was born anew because it was a name old in the annals of Europe as far back as the 12th century. Lithuania was an entity when the hordes from the east which overran it were a nameless force; and during the Middle Ages it was a powerful state. It fell before the Russians in 1795, and many armies marched across its soil in succeeding years. In 1940, after 22 years of freedom, in which Lithuania contributed much to the culture and industry of the world, it was swallowed up by the Soviet Union. But the valiant people of this nation have kept alive their burning desire for freedom and independence and will continue their fight to become once again a free nation among other nations.

To this day the United States has refused to recognize the "de jure" absorption of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Like other freedom-loving people the world over, we believe that every man and every country has a God-given right to liberty. We salute the inspiring example of resistance and determination shown by the Lithuanian people behind the Iron Curtain, and denounce the Soviet Union for its brutality and imperialism.

The soul of Lithuania lives today. It lives sadly in Europe beneath the yoke of the Soviet Union. It lives seriously in the hearts of its countrymen abroad, who see their motherland bent beneath the Communist yoke. And it lives proudly here in the United States where these brave, persevering, liberty-loving people have maintained their national characteristics and have contributed much and in many ways to the communities around them. It will continue to live and one day we fervently hope in the not too distant future Lithuania will be a free and independent nation again.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 41 years ago this week, after a century and a quarter of imperial Russian domination, the freedom-loving people of Lithuania saw the dawn of a new day which they hoped and fervently believed would become a lasting era of independence for them. The tragic end of that freedom by the ruthless onslaughts of the Soviets is known to the entire world. The godless Red rule was even worse than the czarist yoke and the devout Lithuanian people prayed for deliverance from its terrors. In a year, almost to the day, Stalin was himself the victim of the treachery of his former partner-in-crime, Hitler, and Soviet domination in Lithuania came to an end. Any joy that the Lithuanian people had in being rid of the Soviet executioners and kidnappers was short lived when the true nature of the Nazi reign asserted itself. For more than 3 years these brave people suffered

under another tyranny little different from what they had been enduring.

In midyear of 1944 the Red army again crossed the Lithuanian border. In the hypocritical jargon of the Red dictator, the Soviets were liberating Lithuania from the capitalist and Fascist exploiters. The whole world now knows the horrors of that kind of liberation.

These are historical facts that need no elaboration at this time and it is not my purpose to review them. I do, however, want to pay my tribute to the character of the brave Lithuanian people and to express the wish that a solution to their trials will soon be found. The hearts of all of us who enjoy the blessings of liberty go out to these courageous men and women who are today deprived of their cherished freedom. The Red tyrants have not a thing in common with these victims—neither religion, nor culture, nor language—and they will never absorb them into the maw of Soviet atheism by which every individual is demeaned and made subservient to the idolatry of the state. We in the United States must let the Lithuanian people know of our sympathy with their cause. We must do all we can by peaceful means to help them regain their long-pursued liberty. We pray that they will be sustained in their struggle.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with all my fellow Americans in commemorating the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian national independence, and take this occasion to extend my personal greetings to all of our fellow citizens of Lithuanian descent.

The case of Lithuania stands as a symbol of the right of every nation, large or small, to be free and independent. It also carries with it a great human story of a heroic people who struggled over the centuries for their independence—a struggle carried on by an entire nation against the Russian despots. The Lithuanian nation, after winning its independence, demonstrated its real friendship for the United States and its unfaltering allegiance to the same free institutions which we so cherish. We Americans have always been proud of the support we gave to the Lithuanian nation in its struggle against the Russians and in building their democratic way of life which characterized Lithuania during the period between the Great Wars.

There is an unbreakable bond between the United States and Lithuania which has been solidly forged upon the anvil of time and experience.

All men of good will are saddened by the plight of Lithuania today, as it stands occupied by the Russian despots. Lithuania has an alien government imposed by the Kremlin which has proclaimed its bitter enmity for the United States and our free way of life, but the Lithuanian people have kept faith with us in their determined adherence to the cause of human freedom—despite the terrible penalties they must continue to pay for that position.

Lithuania, like the other non-Russian nations occupied by the Kremlin, sees in the United States the last great hope for civilization. We as a Nation stand as a bright symbol to the certainty that

Lithuania will once again be free and independent.

There are strange voices in the world today calling for a recognition of the status quo, a deal with the Russians whereby Russia would keep intact its vast empire of slavery in exchange for which we would be spared the Russian hatchet for a few fleeting, humiliating years.

The modern day Russian czar, Khrushchev, in a speech delivered from Minsk last year, stated that the only problem to be negotiated between the Russians and the free world was acceptance of a status quo. He stated in unmistakable words that unless the United States and our allies are prepared to accept this first condition, negotiation of such other problems as there might be would not be considered by the Russians. In other words Khrushchev told the world that the Russians were prepared to grant a temporary peace if the free world would recognize the present day Russian empire and undertake a nonaggression pact which would announce to the world that all the people behind the Iron Curtain were doomed to everlasting slavery.

But the voice of Khrushchev is not the only voice being heard in the world advocating this proposal. The misguided and naive George Kennan, who has been posed as a Russian expert, is the spokesman in the free world for this plan of silent surrender. But there are other such voices, most fearing to speak out publicly, but nevertheless actively working behind the scenes for this sellout. With each passing day the devious effort to force the U.S. Government into recognition of the status quo takes on added intensity. This maneuver does violence to the hopes and aspirations of all the American people. The American people do not seek a few, fleeting and humiliating years during which they cringe awaiting the final death blow from the Russians to our free way of life. But these voices, alien to the United States and the wishes of the American people, are gaining strength in the high councils of the Government.

There is greater need today than ever before in our history for the American people to be vigilant in the defense of our individual liberties and the advocacy of the right of every nation to be free and independent. We know that the best guarantee for our own liberty and safety is a world in which every nation is free and all empires are dissolved.

On this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian national independence, I urge that the foreign policy of the United States be brought under critical review by the American people. In this respect the Congress of the United States can and will perform its part. The American people will, in the end, however, determine how soon we will drive these strange voices advocating a silent surrender to the Russians out into the open where they can be properly dealt with. I shall continue to do all I possibly can to hasten the day when Lithuania will be restored to its independence and its rightful position among the nations of the world.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my comments to those of

other Members of the House who today, with the multitude of Americans of Lithuanian descent and, indeed, with freedom-loving people everywhere, observe the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuania proclaimed her independence, after scores of years of Russian domination. Lithuania embarked on the course of progress. She made great strides forward—in land reform, education, commerce, agriculture and industry. This progress under freedom was ended 19 years ago when the Soviet Union forcibly annexed this brave nation, imposing a brutal rule that unfortunately has continued.

We are certain, however, that the spark of freedom has not been extinguished among Lithuanians. The independence of Lithuania as a nation may have been short lived, but the love of liberty is undying, as the masters of the Soviet Union have surely discovered in their efforts to enslave the Lithuanian people.

To these brave men and women, we extend our friendship, our sympathy, and our prayers that the day soon will dawn when Lithuania again takes her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence is being observed today. I am pleased to join with my colleagues and the many friends of Lithuania in commemorating this day of independence, for the peoples of Lithuania, now subjected to the tyrannical rule of Soviet Russia, are prohibited from observing it. Our sympathy is extended to the many Lithuanian Americans who deplore the enslavement under which their kinfolk in Lithuania must live and whose hearts must ever be filled with anxiety for those in the homeland.

The people of Lithuania, who fought so long and bravely for their independence, finally achieved it in 1918. Their progress in all fields of their endeavors and their fine achievements were outstanding; during the short period of their independence, the people earned the admiration of democratic peoples everywhere for their ideals, industry, and high resolve. After the short period of 22 years, their independence was crushed and their country was again brought under Russian rule.

We salute the brave people of Lithuania and extend the hand of friendship to them. As the cause of Lithuania is just and righteous, as she is entitled to her freedom, we hope and pray for the day when her independence will be restored to her.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, marks the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by Lithuania. The people of Lithuania prevailed over the Soviet Communists in 1918 but are again engaged in a struggle with the Communists for their freedom and independence. Since 1940, when the Soviet Union forcefully occupied and illegally annexed Lithuania and her sister Baltic States of Estonia and Latvia, the Lithuanian people have been subjected to cruel and ruthless treatment at the

hands of the Communists. Thousands of Lithuanians have been deported to Siberia or murdered under the Soviet plan of Russification of the Lithuanian Nation.

Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain have been fighting the evils of Communist aggression and suppression for 19 years now. In spite of the apparent hopelessness of their present position, the Lithuanian people have not lost heart and given up their struggle for freedom. These valiant people deserve the highest praise for their perseverance and determination. The example of their survival in the face of such ruthless foreign domination will remain an inspiration to future generations.

America has shown she is interested in the plight of the Lithuanians and other captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The U.S. Government has never recognized the incorporation of Lithuania, Estonia, or Latvia by the Soviet Union as legal. The American people will never cease to hope and pray for the deliverance of the Lithuanians from their Communist aggressors.

America can help to keep alive the hopes of the Lithuanian people by continuing to show our interest and sympathy with their cause. We should publicize the truth about Lithuania and extend to these people all the encouragement we can.

The Lithuanian Nation will not be destroyed so long as the Lithuanian people can preserve their hopes for eventual freedom and independence. With our support the Lithuanians can and will survive this terrible ordeal as they have survived other periods of Russian domination in the past. They have a heritage of prosperity and progress as an independent republic and a history as a nation dating back to the 13th century, of which they are justly proud. Such people, in whom the fires of freedom and justice burn brightly, are not easily defeated.

We have a common cause—to hold back the Communists. We all know that the Communist goals are to destroy the free world and with it the personal and economic freedoms of all people. In order to prevent this, the free peoples of the world must unite with the Lithuanians to destroy the scourge of communism. If the free world remains resolute and vigilant, we will prevail.

The time will come when the Communist regime in Lithuania and the other Baltic States which is based on force and lies will collapse. Then Lithuania can reestablish herself as a prosperous free nation.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 41 years ago Lithuania, a little land on the Baltic Sea, overthrew a Czarist reign that had oppressed its people for more than 100 years. For two exciting decades the independent republic thrived and became a respected nation among nations.

Then, when the storm clouds of World War II shattered over Europe, Lithuania was again engulfed by the oppressor from the east, who this time was bigger, godless, and more ruthless than the czars. Lithuania was but one of a num-

ber of Baltic and East European states that were forcibly annexed by the Soviet Union.

We take this occasion, the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence, to protest the Soviet seizure in the name of free mankind. We hold it to be self-evident that free democracies make free men, and, since our Declaration of Independence, we have held that the condition of freedom is and always shall be an inalienable right of men everywhere.

May the fate of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors serve, at the very least, to remind the people of Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and the Americas of the nature of Soviet imperialism, and may we be warned that behind its cape of professed friendship is hidden a steel blade.

I congratulate the Lithuanian American Information Center and its ceaseless campaign for liberty, an affirmation, indeed, of the fact that a people's spirit cannot be crushed by the weight of tyrannical rule. With all Lithuanian-Americans, and those Lithuanians who endure silently behind the Red flag, let us hope and pray that someday their right of self-determination will be restored.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, each year—there are 41 of them now—some of us pause to remember this day.

The commemoration of any national independence holiday is a bittersweet thing. For us in America the 4th of July is a time of heat, fireworks, ice cream, and speeches. We look back on our forefathers' struggles in 1776 with nostalgia, pride, and a certain degree of contentment. While our span of history is short in comparison with that of Europe, we have thrived, expanded, and grown in world stature and responsibility. These accomplishments have been made possible because of our sovereign independent freedom.

Freedom is first a state of mind. From that state of mind is made possible the dynamics of responsible action. Whenever man's state of mind is limited by an outside force the inevitable corollary is a limitation of his action. He no longer is a wholly responsible being.

This day, February 16, 1959, marks the 41st anniversary of a people who have spent the majority of contemporary history as living examples of overt foreign domination. The Lithuanian people have been deprived of their birthright. For only two score years—between the two world wars—have the Lithuanians known freedom. Yet, the significance of these twenty odd years makes present Soviet domination historically transitory. The idea of freedom is a potent thing, the reality of the idea is even stronger; but, when the reality is vanquished by force and brutality, the will of any subject people is unbreakable. Those of Lithuanian stock throughout the United States know that this is true. You gentlemen in this room know that this is true. In their deepest inner knowledge the leaders of the Soviet Union know this is true.

It is in recognition of the symbolic meaning of this day that I am glad to

salute the Lithuanian people on the anniversary of their independence. May the fulfillment of freedom that lives in their hearts be theirs once again.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, on today citizens of Lithuanian descent throughout the country are commemorating the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence—a historic event in the world struggle for freedom and justice. This day reminds us once more of the heroism of the people of Lithuania and her neighboring countries of Latvia and Estonia, and their courageous efforts and determination to keep up their fight for their national independence.

The people of Lithuania who have made their homes in this country have made notable contributions to America. The present circumstances in their former homeland are of grave concern to Lithuanian Americans, and to all Americans. The United States has always deplored the Soviet exploitation of Lithuania and other Baltic countries. I am glad to join with other Members of the U.S. Congress today in paying homage and honor to the victims of Soviet aggression in Lithuania, and in protest of the continuation of Soviet occupation and tyranny.

I wish to include in my remarks the following excerpts from a letter received from Mary M. Kizis, director of the Lithuanian American Information Center in New York City:

Lithuanian Americans are planning commemorative services in New York City on Sunday, February 15, under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of Greater New York. This observance will be commemorated the world over; in practically every State in the Union. It is a forbidden holiday in Lithuania. Lithuania, as you know, was not a new state after World War I; her recorded history began in the 11th century. During the years of independence, from 1918 to 1940 (when she was forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union), Lithuania's progress in all spheres of endeavor was remarkable. She earned the right to take her place in the family of free nations. The present situation in Lithuania is of grave concern to Lithuanian Americans, the majority of whom have kinfolk in the old country. Few people are permitted to leave the country and no visitors are allowed. Lithuanians still look to the United States with hope. Lithuanian Americans are grateful to the United States for never having recognized the illegal annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union. They are grateful for broadcasts to Lithuania over the Voice of America in the Lithuanian language.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, today should be a day of joyous celebration for Lithuanians everywhere, for it is the 41st anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of that courageous nation.

Unfortunately, it is not a day for joy but one of sad commemoration because of the communist tyrants who rule Soviet Russia.

It was with great hope that Lithuania proclaimed its independence on February 16, 1918, to end 123 years of servitude to Imperialistic Russian rule. It was then that the light of liberty was rekindled in Lithuania. The Lithuanian people were free. They could now

bring about the realization of their dreams, hopes, and ambitions.

But freedom for Lithuania was short lived. On the dark day of June 15, 1940, the Soviet Russian Army marched into Lithuania, bringing a new Russian imperialism and Communist tyranny to the struggling nation. It was a black day in the history of the world.

The Soviet Russian action was in complete violation of all treaties, including its own mutual assistance pact with Lithuania that guaranteed Lithuanian independence and of Russian non-interference in the domestic, social, and economic order of that nation.

How typical of the warlords of the Kremlin. Treaties, pacts, and agreements mean nothing to them. The seizure of Lithuania should forever be a lesson to the world of the intent and purposes of the Communist forces of Soviet Russia. It is a lesson that we here in the Halls of the Congress should not forget as we join Lithuanians everywhere in the solemn commemoration of the 41st anniversary of their declaration of independence.

Although their nation was treacherously seized and its people have been subjected to all types of brutality by the Russian Communists, the Lithuanians' love for liberty has not died. They wait patiently and with determination for the day when they will be free again; when again Lithuania will be able to take her place with the free nations of the world.

On this solemn day, may we all join in extending our deepest sympathy and friendship to these brave people, who had made such magnificent strides as a free nation. May we also join in prayer with these courageous people that the day of deliverance for Lithuania soon will be realized and that the light of freedom will glow once more over their land.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we who represent the American people in the Congress of the United States are privileged once again to commemorate the gallant and unceasing struggle for freedom which has been waged for 41 years by a brave people in a tiny land in Eastern Europe.

Forty-one years ago, the people of Lithuania declared their independence and established a new government on the shores of the Baltic Sea.

For the next 22 years, Lithuanians struggled to retain and strengthen their freedom—and struggled successfully.

Then, in June of 1940, the armies of Soviet Russia—in crass and open violation of international law and of the rights of man—invaded Lithuania and subjected its people to as brutal a tyranny as the world has seen in many generations.

That tyrannous and unjust rule has continued to this day, but the people of Lithuania have never given up their love of freedom and their courageous fight to reestablish it once again.

Here in the United States, their sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, have helped to keep strong the hopes of Lithuanian freedom. As one who is privileged to represent a district in which many

Americans of Lithuanian descent now reside, I have watched with pride their enduring devotion to this great cause.

It is very much in the American tradition to value freedom so greatly as to fight for it and, if necessary, die for it. The dedication of so many Lithuanian-Americans to freedom—not only for their homeland but for others wherever it has been threatened—may help explain the great contribution they have made to their adopted land as American citizens.

Their fellow Americans—from all the lands of the earth—are proud to join with them today in commemorating the struggle we shall endlessly pursue until victory is ours: independence for Lithuania, and peace and freedom throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, as the New York Times said today, "In the Baltic countries the path to a better future is still dark, but it is not lost and will not be. The day of the overlords will not last forever."

In this same spirit, Mr. Speaker, I include resolutions unanimously adopted by Lithuanian-Americans of Linden, N.J. at this point in my remarks as a testament to the hopes of all Americans who love freedom.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED ON FEBRUARY 8, 1959, BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF LINDEN, N.J., GATHERED UNDER AUSPICES OF LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, LINDEN BRANCH, FOR COMMEMORATION OF THE 41ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Whereas on February 16, 1918, Lithuania was formally declared a free and independent state by the Council of Lithuania in Vilnius; and

Whereas Americans of Lithuanian origin, commemorating this year the 41st anniversary of the establishment of a free and independent Lithuania, strive to actuate the fact, that the years of independent government fully proved and justified the nation's integrity for self-government and completely warranted credence and recognition as a free and independent state, accorded her by the other world nations; and

Whereas the Americans of Lithuanian descent hope that Lithuania, presently occupied by the Communist Soviets, will again regain the rights of freedom and liberty as a sovereign nation; and

Whereas now, more than ever, it has been proven that no one nation's security is assured of the ominous threat of a dictatorial communism, lately bolstered by scientific progression to be utilized for further harassment of world peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, Americans of Lithuanian descent, are determined and united to uphold the efforts of the Lithuanian people to regain their independence and liberation; and

Resolved, That the Government of the United States approve or indorse no agreement which would in any manner accede to the outgrowth of any past, present, or future Soviet aggressive action; and

Resolved, That we declare, as in the past, our appreciation of the United States policy of non-recognition of the incorporation by force of Lithuania into the Soviet Union; and

Resolved, That it is our hope, that the representatives of our Government will firmly maintain this policy at any future deliberations regarding the status of enslaved nations; and

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Dwight D. Eisenhower;

to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles; to the U.S. permanent representative to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.; to the U.S. Senators of New Jersey, the Honorable Harrison A. Williams and the Honorable Clifford P. Case; and to the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer.

JOHN LIUDVINAITIS,
President.
VLADAS TURSA,
Secretary.

LINDEN, N.J., February 8, 1959.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Lithuanian Independence Day is significant to all peoples everywhere who are actively seeking a solution to the contemporary ideological and political struggles current in the world. From a proud, ancient and independent past, first recorded by the Roman historian Tacitus, the Lithuanian people have been forced to continually fight for national survival. Today, Lithuanians look back over the last five centuries and see 22 years of complete freedom. Twenty-two years of liberty in 5 centuries is a very short length of time, gentlemen.

However, even after being dominated by first Poland, then Russia, Germany and now Russia once again, the Lithuanian people have never lost faith in their guiding principles of democracy and liberty. The sands of history have not been kind. For only a few short years after World War I did the Lithuanian people have their independence. This was made possible by the dissolution of Czarist Russia and the realization of President Wilson's 14 points. What joy these people must have known.

And then the destruction of it all: The Red army—the swiftness of Hitler's legions and now the Red army once again. The Lithuanian people are completely isolated; their only contact with the rest of the world is through the memory of their friends and loved ones who live in the citadel of the West.

The United States has continued to recognize the free Lithuanian Republic and has deprecated the Soviet conquest. The government now controlling the destiny of the Lithuanian people is not the government of the people; it is the government of tyranny, of barbarism and brutality. No nation can forever maintain control by terror. History bears this truth.

Now, until some future time when the Lithuanian people can lift their heads and hearts in freedom once more, it is the duty, and my honor, for all free men everywhere to take a moment and pay tribute to the spirit of the Lithuanian people. It is the same spirit upon which America and the whole of the Western tradition is built—the spirit of independence, human dignity, and progress. This spirit is contingent upon one thing: freedom.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, we commemorate the 41st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Lithuania. On this occasion we pay tribute to a people who with tenacity and innate national vitality have clung to the best, and advanced the cultural traditions of the West and whose fight for freedom has

continued despite every obstacle and discouragement.

In paying tribute to Lithuania, and its people, and in commemorating the anniversary of its independence we must take this opportunity to remind ourselves, the free world, yes, and those who consider themselves neutrals, of certain facts, which amid pressing international events we might forget:

First, February 16, 1918, the restoration of the independence of Lithuania was declared by the council of Lithuania at Vilnius.

Second, By treaty of peace of July 12, 1920, Soviet Russia recognized Lithuania as a fully self-governing and completely independent state.

Third, By the nonaggression pact of September 28, 1926, the Soviet Union agreed to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and inviolability of Lithuania under all circumstances.

Fourth, In total disregard of these treaties of peace and nonaggression, the Soviet Union seized and illegally incorporated Lithuania into the empire of the Soviet Union.

Fifth, These acts of aggression committed by the Soviet Union are in direct violation of international law, the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration and Charter of the United Nations all of which were signed by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and other nations. In their diatribes against the United States the Soviets have used the term "imperialist" and claim for themselves the role of liberators of oppressed peoples.

I call upon you my colleagues and through you the freedom-loving countries of the world to look into the record of Soviet relations with Lithuania to evaluate that record in terms of the appellation "liberators of oppressed peoples." These actions of the U.S.S.R. in violation of the treaties they have signed all are a matter of record.

Lithuania began her existence as a powerful and independent state during the Middle Ages and reached the height of her power after the Battle of Tannenberg—1410. Besides checking the eastward drive of the Teutonic Knights, Lithuania protected Europe from the Mongols and the Tartars. Thus by the beginning of the 15th century, she had become a formidable East European power with territories stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea, even embracing White Russia and the Ukraine.

Recognition of human freedom, education, and toleration marked the Lithuanian Government during this period of its power; and it played an important part in the general development of European civilization during this time.

Decline came with the 18th century and the growth of the power of the czars. Lithuania, although dominated by Russia refused to bow her head to the Russian yoke and in revolt after revolt attempted to strike for freedom. Consequences were severe. In 1831 the University of Vilna was closed as were schools and monasteries. The Czar Nicholas I set out upon a program of suppression of Lithuanian culture. Use of the language was forbidden, the Cath-

olic religion was proscribed. Suppression, hangings, exile to Siberia failed to still love of freedom and independence in the Lithuanian heart.

World War I furnished Lithuanian leaders with the opportunity for which generations of freedom fighters had been waiting. Although war had devastated and impoverished the country, the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed February 16, 1918 at Vilnius. The treaty of peace, July 12, 1920, recognized Lithuania as an independent state.

During two decades of independent existence the country grew and prospered. Under an independent government the domestic economy grew and was diversified: foreign trade expanded, social services never before dreamed of were instituted. Education which had been impeded during the Russian regime was made compulsory. Besides 2,560 elementary schools attended by 292,000 pupils, the government of the republic opened special schools for the study of agriculture—the chief industry of the country.

With World War II came the end of Lithuania as a country dedicated to the general welfare. It was cold-bloodedly incorporated into the Soviet Union in an act of aggression devoid of legal foundation or moral justification.

The Acting Secretary of State put the United States on record July 23, 1940, in the following statement:

During the past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, has been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.

From the day when the people of these Republics first gained their independence and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state however powerful in the domestic affairs of any other state, however weak.

The balance of the dreary events have been told in this Chamber many times. I shall spare you repetition. Suffice it to say the self-styled liberator of oppressed peoples has followed a policy of extermination against Lithuania through mass deportations, slave labor, biological extermination, and complete destruction of cultural values.

Were it not for the unconquerable spirit of the people of Lithuania, both those who languish under Soviet rule and those who have escaped to other lands, celebration of this 41st anniversary of their independence might be tinged with bitter irony. But just as they have kept their ancient lore alive in their beautiful language, so freedom and independence flourish in their hearts. Therein lies the promise that one day Lithuania shall gain her freedom.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on this date, February 16, 1959, the 41st anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania is being observed by

the peoples of Lithuania, their relatives, and friends of this heroic nation. We commemorate this occasion with the fervent hope and certainty that Lithuania will again be a free and independent land of opportunity and proud of its heritage.

We realize, from the very nature of our own history, which parallels that of Lithuania, that independence is not a gift and does not come easily. The Lithuanian story is one of outstanding heroism, which eventually led to her independence. During the space of two decades of liberty, Lithuanian progress and achievement in the field of agriculture, education, and industry proved worthy of worldwide respect and honor. This resulted in an unusually high standard of living for the strenuous efforts made toward the freedom we all cherish.

Lithuania is the largest of the Baltic States, and her people are known for their courage and friendliness. The return to independence and freedom is her right. Her people merit peace, opportunity, and safety within her own national boundaries.

The millions of loyal Americans, relatives and friends of the Lithuanian people, are helping to keep the hope of liberty and independence alive. The observance of this day will add a ray of hope toward the day when Lithuania will again take her rightful place in the family of nations in a free world.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join many of my colleagues in marking this 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Despite the tramp of the Soviet military boot which has echoed over Lithuania since 1939, the people of Lithuania, and of the other nations now ruled by Russia through force, live with hope and memory. Their hope is for the day when they and their children will have a second Lithuanian Independence Day to mark the day when the Soviet rule will be thrown off. Their memory is of the years of freedom from this day 41 years ago until the black day in 1939 when the Russians moved in to rule with steel.

I join my colleagues in sending greetings to the people of Lithuania wherever they are on this memorable anniversary. May their ideals and memories stay alive, may their courage and hope never fail them. If there is right in this world, the people of Lithuania will someday be able to know freedom and independence again.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the fact that today, February 16, is Lithuanian Independence Day. But the plain fact is that this day, first celebrated 41 years ago, serves to remind us that Lithuania is no longer free to celebrate this proud day in its history.

The vast majority of freedom-loving American people, I am confident, join with me in a sincere hope that some day the efforts of the free world may result in bringing Lithuania and other freedom-loving countries out from behind the Iron Curtain.

The people of Lithuania have my profound sympathy, and I am sure efforts will continue to be made to bring about

the freedom of Lithuania which the people of that country so ardently desire.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian independence proclamation, I, under unanimous consent, insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my recent remarks to the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

The coming 41st anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania on Monday, February 16, gives me this welcome opportunity to express my most sincere hopes for a renewal of that freedom that Lithuania experienced for the 22 years following 1918. Americans have not ceased to be horrified and angered by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' forcible termination of Lithuanian independence in 1940, and will never recognize that attempt to subjugate a people who have historically demonstrated their love of freedom and their ability to flourish under a free system.

Yet, I know that the Soviet Union's blatant violation of the Law of Nations has not accomplished its purpose, in spite of the annexation of Lithuanian territory, for the Lithuanian peoples have demonstrated that they will not be enslaved in spirit. Their determined search for the support of the Western democracies, their continued listening to the Voice of America, and the very existence of your organization prove that in Lithuania are peoples of courage, fortitude, and devotion to belief in the dignity of man and the inherent value of free institutions.

Although the people of Lithuania in their own country are forbidden to celebrate the anniversary of the restoration, I join my fellow Americans in remembrance of that day to wish for renewed Lithuanian freedom, to admire Lithuanian fortitude, and to praise the devoted work of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate Lithuanians are among the most stout-hearted and bravest fighters for liberty and freedom. Yet, freedom and independence have been denied to them for centuries.

Except for the short but happy interlude of interwar years, they have had the misfortune to suffer under the oppressive and at times almost unbearable alien yoke in their homeland for almost two centuries. During the First World War, it seemed that their woes had come to an end by the overthrow of the Czarist Russian regime, when they regained their freedom by proclaiming their national independence on February 16, in 1918. For about two decades fate was kind to them, and they lived happily in their free country. But, as the clouds of war began to gather over Eastern Europe in 1939, their situation became extremely precarious, and early in the war their independence was shattered by the forces of the Red army.

Since then the unhappy Lithuanians have not known freedom, and have been held down by their Communist overlords. In their own country they lead the lives of prisoners in a vast prison camp, working as long as humanly possible, and under most wretched conditions, for their masters in the Kremlin. There is no trace of freedom, neither of speech, nor of movement, nor of correspondence; not even the freedom to lead a quiet life in any corner of the country.

But they have the satisfaction of knowing that they have friends and

sympathizers in the free world, and particularly in America.

Today on the 41st anniversary celebration of the independence day I gladly join hosts of Americans of Lithuanian descent and echo their true liberty-loving sentiments.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the roots of American strength and greatness have been the diversity of its population. It has been the transfusion of foreign cultures into the circulation of American life that makes our country what it is today. The reasons for immigration to our shores have been varied, but the most tragic of these has been the loss of freedom in the homeland. This was the case in Lithuania.

In the latter part of the 18th century, when Russia absorbed Lithuania, many oppressed Lithuanians, finding freedom and justice more precious than the ties of their native soil, fled to our free shores.

Once in this country, these brave Lithuanians never ceased in their struggle to achieve liberty for their persecuted homeland. Numerous Lithuanian organizations throughout the United States worked vigorously for Lithuanian freedom. This work was not to be in vain, for on February 16, 1918, independence was finally realized. Happily, many Lithuanians returned home, but many more decided to remain in their adopted country.

Lithuania's loss was to be America's gain. Despite the strangeness of our laws, customs, and language, these eager Lithuanians quickly adjusted to the American way of life. Although naturally concerned about the fate of their homeland, these people identified themselves completely with America. They became solid American citizens and have never ceased to be grateful for the opportunities that this country has provided.

On the other hand, Americans have been equally grateful for the contributions of these Lithuanians to the growth of their culture. Evidence of these contributions is shown by the success of Lithuanian-Americans in various fields of endeavor.

The list of their achievements is long. Such names as Mikas Petrauskas, Shirley White, and Ivan Lebedeff are familiar to music and theater lovers. Sport fans have cheered Jack Sharkey, Jack Goodman, and Vito Tamulis. In addition many more have served faithfully in public offices throughout the United States.

These few examples are indicative of the Lithuanian-American contributions to American life.

Nevertheless, although Americans first, these American citizens have a natural concern for the land of their ancestors which once again is not free. Ever since 1940, this helpless country has been incorporated into the Soviet Union. Although today is the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, Lithuanian-American hearts are sad, for today will not be one for rejoicing in the land of their forebears.

Consequently, I would like to take this opportunity, on the anniversary of Lith-

uanian Independence Day, to express with all Lithuanian-Americans their hope of freedom for their oppressed homeland. Moreover, all the free world should resolve on this February 16 to work unceasingly for conditions that will bring peace to the world, allowing all nations to live in an environment of self-government, peace, and justice.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, just a few short weeks ago it was my privilege to participate in the observance of the 41st anniversary of Urkainian freedom.

What I said then can be mirrored today in our commemoration of the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

Before the outbreak of World War II, Lithuania, along with her sister Baltic nations, Estonia and Latvia, was still an independent and democratic state.

But in June 1940 the cherished freedom of Lithuania evaporated with the cruel and unjust seizure of the country by Soviet Russia.

Within 2 days Soviet military troops invaded and tramped through the territory of Lithuania, as well as of Estonia and Latvia.

Lithuania has not been free since that time, but the spirit of freedom, hidden though it is behind the Iron Curtain, remains alive in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians.

Always a proud, virile nation which, through its long history, survived other oppressions, we of free America have little doubt that Lithuania will survive her present persecution and tyranny.

Ruling Lithuania, just as in other Soviet satellite nations, is a detested puppet regime that has stolen from the Lithuanian people all of their political and social rights and has forced them to vote for a single list of candidates designated by the Communist Party.

The people of Lithuania live in constant fear and terror. Their personal security is nonexistent. They are harassed every minute of every day by the agents of the secret police.

Without reason, without fair trials, they are imprisoned, investigated, executed, or deported for slave labor to remote areas of the Soviet Union.

Seven major waves of mass deportations, carried out under inhuman conditions, have diminished the total population of Lithuania by more than 350,000. Lithuania, a predominantly Roman Catholic population, has also seen her priests murdered, jailed, deported, or exiled. Of nearly 2,000 priests, we are told less than 750 remain free and alive.

Monasteries have been closed. Church property has been confiscated. Religious instruction has been forbidden.

What, then, keeps the faint, flickering hopes of the oppressed Lithuanian people alive?

What gives these gallant people the strength to sustain a persecution and a tyranny the like of which the world has not seen for centuries?

Two things, Mr. Speaker, just two things—an unrelenting faith in God and an indomitable courage born of tremendous hope.

And one day, I am confident, this great faith, this fantastic courage will be rewarded, and Lithuania will be delivered

from enslavement, as will all the other oppressed peoples under the yoke of Soviet tyranny.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct privilege for me to add my small voice to the growing demands for freedom on the part of millions of Lithuanians and other nationalistic groups who are being kept in a captive status under the Soviet Communist rule.

Although, Premier Nikita Khrushchev continues to boast of the military strength and the economic advances of the Soviet, he fails to recognize that this apparent strength is based upon a compulsive labor economy that is held together by fear, by military tanks and guns, and by the cloak, spy, and dagger machinations of the select Communist Party membership and leadership.

I am sure that the spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of the Lithuanian people cannot be quenched and will continue to grow. The nationalistic spirit and the desire for freedom on the part of millions of people under the domination of the Soviet Socialist Republics will continue to be a fatal weakness in the miscalculations of Mr. Khrushchev and his Politburo Bureau.

I join with the Lithuanian American Council in today's celebration of the 41st anniversary of the restoration of independence of Lithuania. I join with the millions of Americans of Lithuanian extraction in their aspirations for the liberation of the Lithuanian Nation.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 41st anniversary of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. Because of the many folks of Lithuanian descent in my Third District of Ohio, I feel that it is especially fitting to call attention to this day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In 1918 our country rejoiced with the Lithuanian people when they became a free nation. By decree in 1940 Soviet Russia cut short this independence by absorbing this little, freedom-loving nation. Nevertheless, this act of tyranny could not stamp out the steadily-burning flame of liberty which lives in the Lithuanian people.

We as citizens of a free, democratic nation join with these people and with those of Lithuanian descent in the United States in the fervent hope and prayer that freedom will one day be restored to this long-suffering nation.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today is an anniversary—the anniversary of Lithuanian independence. We in the United States have never known the haunting fear of having our independence physically threatened, let alone the reality of foreign occupation. We can speak of the plight and the bravery of the Lithuanian people, but for most of us we understand their plight only through our imagination. But, nevertheless, here are people—almost 3 million people—that are realistic symbols of man's inhumanity to his fellow man.

The significance of Lithuania to those of us of Western culture is this: From a glorious and ancient past in which the Duchy of Lithuania stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea the Lithuanian people have again and again been bled

by richer and more powerful neighbors. From 1385 until the end of the 18th century Lithuania was part of Poland; then when Poland was annexed by Czarist Russia in 1795 Lithuania shared the same fate. Finally, in 1918, taking dual advantage of President Wilson's 14 points and the Russian revolution, the Lithuanian people declared their independence. This was their first taste of freedom since the 14th century; it lasted 22 years. In June 1940 Soviet troops took over the country. Then almost immediately the land was overrun by the German Army. German occupation lasted from 1941 until 1944, when it was displaced once again by the death grip of the Russian Bear.

I give this thumbnail sketch of the woes of Lithuania not to prove that history can be cruel but, rather, to point a meaningful moral. The Lithuanian people have been relentlessly submerged by force. They are now the unwilling victims of a political religion that seeks converts by every means known. The people of Lithuania in their present political dilemma represent the very thing that America fights against in word and in deed the world over. As such, we honor the people of Lithuania and their friends, relatives, and countrymen that live in the United States as men who have upheld the tenets of Western political culture. These men and women believe in the highest ideals of freedom, justice, and right. They have not been corrupted by Russian words but have seen and felt the sword of social and political tyranny beneath the phrases.

On this anniversary of Lithuanian independence I am proud to be one of those Americans commemorating this day in hopes that Lithuanian independence will soon be the reality that so many have fought, died, and lived for.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 41st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. I consider it an honor and a duty to record my congratulations to the people of Lithuania, whose determination to achieve independence has set an example for all free people. Now, once again, despite the most ruthless suppression at home, Lithuanians everywhere keep alive the embers of liberty. The Soviet efforts to extinguish Lithuania's national identity are a sufficient answer to any who would relax our vigilance or our resistance to further efforts of Soviet expansion. Ultimately Lithuania's determination to regain independence must win out.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I returned from Rochester, Sunday, to find 3 feet of water in my basement, and, yesterday, while others were paying tribute to the courageous people of Lithuania on the 41st anniversary of their independence, I was wading, barefoot, through my basement, in rather frantic pursuit of a number of trunks and footlockers which were floating about.

However, I do want to join with my colleagues in wishing Godspeed to the people of Lithuania in the fulfillment of their dream of once again, someday, breathing the fresh air of liberty and democratic self-government.

For century after century, Lithuania has been subjected to conquest—by Teutonic knights, Tartars, Russian czars, Nazis, and now, since 1940, by the Red terror which rules the Kremlin. From East and West alike, the power hungry of Europe have trampled back and forth across the face of this tiny nation with almost sickening regularity, pillaging and plundering, terrorizing and murdering as only ruthless barbarians are able. Yet, all of the bloodshed and brutality which has been the recurring fate of the people of Lithuania, has not, for all of its physical violence, been able to destroy the will to freedom and independence which has become their hallmark.

Forty-one years ago, at the height of the Russian revolution, Lithuania declared her independence from the disintegrating Russian Empire, and for a little over two decades she struggled to maintain her status as a free, democratic nation. But from the very beginning her existence was a terrifyingly precarious one, for she was wedged squarely between two growing young totalitarian giants, Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany, and both were waiting only for that moment when the fortunes of history would present one of them with a chance to again engulf this little nation. The brief alliance between Stalin and Hitler gave the Soviets the opportunity for which they had been waiting, and by the summer of 1940, Lithuania was once more in the iron grip of the Kremlin.

Almost 19 years have now passed since that fateful summer, and virtually every device known to the twisted despotic mind has been employed in an attempt to destroy the passion for freedom, the deep-rooted national consciousness, and the religious fervor of the people of Lithuania. But love of God, of country, and of liberty continues to burn as brightly as ever in the hearts and minds of Lithuanians everywhere—proof positive that such inborn yearnings will never be extinguished by the godless brutes of this or any other generation.

As they celebrate the 41st anniversary of their independence, I salute the brave and wonderful people of Lithuania, and I join with them in their prayers for a better, more peaceful world tomorrow.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Communist leaders of the Kremlin are using and will continue to use every diabolical means and method to capture the nations of the free world. These Communist leaders seek to destroy the free world by the method of divide and conquer. During this critical period in history the peoples of the free world must remain alert to the intrigue of the Communist masters in the Kremlin. The free world is forced to remain strong militarily, economically, and spiritually. It is paramount that we act as one—in unison. It is paramount that we stand firm in our commitments to one another. It is paramount that the free world agree on every issue and, last but not least, that we maintain our faith in the Almighty. Only then can we avoid the pitfall of being engulfed into the orbit of the Communist fold. Let us recall the fate of those peoples and nations who are now the captives of the U.S.S.R.—

Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, Eastern Germany, not to mention those on the threshold of enslavement.

None of these nations have lost their craving for liberty. It is important to them that we rekindle their hope for freedom and help them maintain their morale. Therefore, on this February 16 Lithuania commemorates the day of its independence and the day of its national birthday. I join with the Lithuanians on this sad occasion and pray that the future holds for them the day of their liberation to which we in the free world rededicate ourselves.

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, I am happy indeed to join in this observance of the 41st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This small nation—whose sons and daughters have contributed so much to the building of America—is, of course, not independent and free today.

Lithuania is a race of character, courage, and culture.

America is indeed grateful for the contributions that men and women of Lithuanian blood have made to our common strength.

They have a faith that the Soviets cannot destroy.

They have courage that the Soviets can never vanquish.

Lithuania has a character that will survive when all the fraud and force of godless tyrants will have vanished from the face of the earth.

This annual commemoration of her independence which was gained more than 41 years ago serves a most useful purpose. It is a reminder of the tragic fate of Lithuania and other countries that were formerly free but today are fettered by the chains of Communist slavery.

But this occasion is far more than a time for tribulation and sorrow over the fate of Lithuania and these other countries which are existing in the darkness of the Iron Curtain. Let us make it a time of rededication in the eternal fight for freedom and independence.

This observance here and throughout other lands where people of Lithuanian blood are living today will be heard behind the Iron Curtain. It will clearly demonstrate to the people of Lithuania that they are not forgotten, that their struggles are the struggles of the freedom-loving world.

It will help to keep bright in their minds and hearts the flames of hope for the day of liberation.

Our own Nation must also make it abundantly clear to all other nations that we stand for liberation from tyranny and oppression and for self-determination and freedom of choice for all peoples to ordain and to establish their own form of government under democratic processes.

I, therefore, extend congratulations to the Lithuanian people on this anniversary of their independence day. Let us all join them in more than words in their efforts to unloose the shackles of tyrants and reestablish their independence.

All hail to Lithuania on the anniversary of its 41st birthday. May her cou-

rageous people soon regain their precious liberties.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, today we think of wars as the worst events in human history, and as the horrors of destruction and death that are sure to be caused by wars in this atomic bomb and nuclear age, we dread the thought of any war. In this we are probably and rightly justified in regarding wars as scourges of the human race. That is the consensus of today. But in the past, even in the relatively recent past, there have been wars which were regarded as the only way out of difficult international situations, and even out of some imminent calamities. Certainly defensive wars are always treated in this spirit. The First World War is also regarded as such by many peoples who found their liberation and independence in the culmination of that war. As that world holocaust drew to its close, autocratic monarchies tumbled down one after the other: The Russian czarist regime, monarchical Germany, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, all perished in that destructive and devastating war. And that war shattered the chains which held millions of innocent and helpless people in bondage and servitude. The Lithuanians were among these people.

The Lithuanian people have a distinct place in the turbulent history of north-eastern Europe. They are justly proud of their long and glorious past. For centuries the Lithuanian kingdom was a powerful force in the whole East European region. At times they not only successfully repelled some of the incursions of barbarian invaders from the east, but they were the stouthearted champions of Christianity and its advance guard in that part of Europe. Late in the 16th century their kingdom was united with the Polish kingdom, and formed a dual monarchy. This union lasted for about 200 years. During that time the destinies of both nations were wedded together. In the late 18th century when Poland was partitioned, most of Poland and with it all Lithuania was incorporated into the Russian Empire. But the loss of national independence almost 200 years ago did not mean the loss of the spirit of freedom on the part of Lithuanians. While they suffered under the autocratic regime of the czars, they worked hard for the attainment of their freedom. They became firmly convinced that individual and national well-being could not be fully achieved or enjoyed without national political independence. They learned that in order to enjoy the benefits of their labor, they should have complete freedom in their homeland. To regain that freedom they worked ceaselessly, but it took them more than a full century to see their cherished dream come true. Not until the detested regime of the czars was overthrown could they have their freedom. In 1917 when that regime was shattered by the Russian Revolution, then, along with other peoples, the Lithuanians felt free. On February 16, 1918, they proclaimed their independence and set up their Republic. That day marks a new day in the modern history of the Lithuanian people.

Both in the attainment of Lithuanian independence and in its maintenance for more than two decades the United States has made important contributions, officially and unofficially. The encouragement which the Lithuanians found in the famous 14 points of our former President Wilson was a boon to their cause. It was a source of inspiration for them to know that their struggle for liberty and independence had the support of our wartime President and our people. Nor was the moral and material aid given to Lithuania by the people of this country, especially by the body of our loyal citizens of Lithuanian descent, of less significance. With such aid, and through their own industry and perseverance, the Lithuanian people turned their war-torn country, in a short time, into a happy habitat for all lovers of freedom and liberty. They worked wonders in making Lithuania a prosperous and progressive democracy, a model in many respects. And during those two decades the people were happy, leading a contented life. But, unfortunately, this period did not last long. As the war clouds began to thicken in the late 1930's, Lithuania sensed the danger to her independence. No mercy was expected from either totalitarian regimes, neither from Berlin nor from Moscow. In the end, however, it was Moscow that in a series of villainous acts put an end to Lithuanian independence in July of 1940 and enslaved the people.

Today, for more than 18 years, unhappy Lithuanians find themselves once more in chains and cut off from all contacts with the free world. There are some 3 million helpless and innocent souls completely sealed off behind the Iron Curtain. Many elemental means of livelihood and all freedoms are denied to them. They live as in a large prison camp, to work as slaves for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. Communist rulers of the country have been doing their very worst to eradicate any feeling of nationality and, one might say, rationality, among its inhabitants. All national events and the observance are rigidly controlled and prescribed. There is no freedom of speech, of press, of movement, and no one is free to correspond with people in the free world. The only freedom these poor souls have, the one which their heartless overlords cannot take away from them, is to cherish their freedom and pray for deliverance from Communist totalitarianism. On this historic anniversary, on the 41st Lithuanian Independence Day, I hope that they will regain their freedom and once more enjoy it in their historic homeland.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania was declared an independent state on February 16, 1918, 41 years ago. Each year Lithuanians in the free world commemorate this occasion remembering their fellow countrymen held captive behind the Iron Curtain, who cannot overtly join in any celebration of this historic event.

The development and growth of Lithuania as an independent republic was brought to a tragic end in 1940 when this proud nation again fell prey to the

superior force of the Soviet Union. Lithuania along with the other Baltic States was fraudulently annexed to the Soviet Union under the guise of a free election. A puppet government which does not express the will of the people was established.

The example of Lithuania is typical of Communist aggression. In every case the Communists have come to power by means of subversion and infiltration by Soviet agents and occupation of the territory by the Red army and political elements from the Kremlin. The Communists then enslave the people by threats and such inhuman means as wholesale deportations and forced famines.

What little information is obtained from behind the Iron Curtain clearly shows that the Communists in Lithuania and in other captive nations maintain a completely tyrannical rule over the people. Lithuanians can no longer enjoy freedom of expression or religion or any of the inherent rights of individuals. Free labor has been abolished as have all other aspects of individual enterprise. Under Communist rule, the family is no longer the basic unit of society. The state takes the major share of responsibility for the training of youth in order to insure their complete allegiance to the Soviet Communist Union.

These things could happen to all the free people of the world if we do not remain vigilant. Communism is a conspiracy which plans to conquer the whole world and bring all peoples under the domination of the Kremlin.

The people of Lithuania have never stopped wanting their national independence or remaining faithful to the ideals of the free world. But these people need our help and continued assurance of our sympathy and interest in their plight. Let us not forget the Lithuanians who have so bravely and steadfastly fought for freedom in the past and who depend on the friendship and solidarity of the free people of the world.

MINERAL EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, occasionally these days we hear some rise up in opposition to the differential tax treatment accorded the mineral extractive industries. More particularly, we hear suggestions and even demands that the 27½ percent depletion rate for oil and gas should be reduced say to 15 percent. Without attempting to set forth here all of the basic reasons why a cut in percentage depletion would be unsound and contrary to the best interest of the con-

suming public and, yes, even a threat to national security, I would like to cite you some very startling statistics just published by the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

First when considering these figures, let us keep in mind that one of the primary purposes for percentage depletion is that it helps to recognize that mineral producers are using up their capital upon the removal of each barrel of oil or ton of ore. Thus, depletion helps to provide additional funds to be used in the further search for needed and essential oil and gas reserves.

Of course, some oil producers do get rich just as some men get rich in every endeavor. We are often told that it is because of depletion that oil producers get rich. However, Mr. Speaker, these U.S. Government statistics, that I am about to place in the Record, do not bear this out. Instead they show that the oil producing industry in 1955 spent more than three times as much looking for new oil reserves as they could possibly have received in depletion. That is, for every dollar from percentage depletion plowed back in the search for and development of new oil reserves, the oil producing industry put up and spent \$2 from other sources.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record a memorandum which includes the results of a study by Mr. C. C. Anderson, Chief Petroleum Engineer, U.S. Bureau of Mines:

PERCENTAGE DEPLETION AND COST OF FINDING PETROLEUM

Government statistics now are available which show the relationship between expenditures for finding and developing new oil reserves and the role percentage depletion plays in this job of finding oil.

The Chief Petroleum Engineer of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, in a paper prepared for the World Power Conference in Montreal, Canada, September 1958, states that in the year 1955 the U.S. petroleum-producing industry—including both independents and major companies—expended a total of \$5.1 billion in the search for and development of new petroleum reserves within the United States. This study also shows that for the year 1955, finding and developing costs together with lifting and other operating costs were in excess of income from petroleum production for the entire producing industry by approximately one-half billion dollars.

The \$5.1 billion expended in 1955 in the exploration for and development of new oil reserves was equivalent to \$2.40 per barrel of net crude oil production in that year. Based on the U.S. Bureau of Mines average wellhead price of crude oil for the year 1955 of \$2.77 per barrel, the theoretical maximum percentage depletion could not have exceeded 76 cents per barrel. This depletion figure, however, for petroleum producers is a theoretical maximum, based on the 27½-percent rate, rather than the actual amount of depletion since the 50 percent of net income limitation reduces the average effective depletion rate for the petroleum industry to no more than 23 percent.

Thus, the domestic petroleum industry's exploration and development expenditures alone in 1955—not including lifting costs, taxes, etc.—totaled \$2.40 per barrel or more than three times the maximum percentage depletion of 76 cents. That is, for every dollar from percentage depletion plowed back in the search for new oil reserves, the producing industry put up and spent \$2 for other sources.

This information, detailed in the accompanying table, clearly demonstrates that the petroleum-producing industry requires new capital far in excess of the depletion deduction to carry on the constant search for new oil and gas reserves.

Net value of production versus expenditures for finding, developing, and producing oil and gas

(Thousands of dollars)

	1951	1953	1955
Industry income:			
Net value oil produced.....	\$4,862,136	\$5,401,018	\$5,884,215
Net value gas produced.....	465,451	660,501	836,324
Total net value production.....	5,327,587	6,061,519	6,720,539
Industry expenditures-exploration costs:			
Geological, geo-physical, and related professional services.....	186,000	243,590	245,440
Lease purchases and rentals.....	637,910	744,630	876,520
Dry holes.....	650,290	795,890	940,210
Overhead.....	126,780	171,270	206,220
Total exploration costs.....	1,600,980	1,955,380	2,268,390
Development costs:			
Drilling and completion of producing wells.....	1,390,050	1,689,607	2,097,225
Equipment (tubing, tanks, flow value, etc.).....	420,360	483,000	550,210
Overhead.....	135,780	168,378	205,640
Total development costs.....	1,946,190	2,340,985	2,853,075
Subtotal exploration and development costs.....	3,547,170	4,296,365	5,121,465
Operating costs:			
Oil:			
Direct costs.....	1,274,149	1,392,576	1,540,092
Overhead.....	242,146	306,326	337,758
Total oil operating costs.....	1,516,295	1,698,902	1,877,850
Gas:			
Direct costs.....	89,220	134,675	134,097
Overhead.....	7,758	10,920	9,387
Total gas operating costs.....	96,978	145,595	143,484
Oil:			
Total operating costs.....	1,613,273	1,844,497	2,021,334
Total expenditures for finding, developing, and producing.....	5,160,443	6,140,862	7,148,799
Net annual balance.....	+167,144	-79,343	-428,260

* Includes maintenance, supervision, and general overhead but excludes charges for research. The costs do not include income taxes, payment on interest and principal, or return to investors.

Source: "Petroleum and Natural Gas in the United States—Relation of Economics and Technologic Trends" by C. C. Anderson, Chief Petroleum Engineer, U.S. Bureau of Mines, Washington, D.C.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I hope that those among us who rise up in opposition to percentage depletion will read and digest these facts and see that the 27½-percent depletion rate for oil and gas is sound and fair. That it has helped to establish and maintain the United States as the world's greatest producer and consumer of petroleum products.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that rather than criticize this tax provision, we should thank God we have it and also that we

have an industry that will risk \$2 for every one provided through depletion to keep on looking for oil.

THE NEW MINIMUM WAGE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a bill and a section-by-section analysis of that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, all of us are keenly aware that this session of the Congress must cope with problems of the utmost gravity, both in our domestic affairs and in the world at large. There have already been introduced, in these first few weeks, a great many well-conceived and imaginative proposals to meet the Nation's needs in such areas as unemployment, distressed areas, and defense.

I do not minimize the importance of these measures. But it is my sincere conviction that a bill I have introduced today, with the support of a number of my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor, deals with an issue of paramount significance to our own people and to the prestige of democracy throughout the world.

This bill would increase the Federal minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour, and would broaden the coverage of the law to include some 7 million workers who now have no wage-hour protection whatever.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the original wage-hour law, pledged the Congress to correct and as rapidly as possible to eliminate terms of employment which are detrimental to the health and well-being of the Nation's wage earners.

That pledge has never been redeemed. On the contrary, it might well be argued that the original minimum wage of 25 cents an hour, and the original coverage of the law, came closer to meeting its objectives than the \$1 minimum and the more restricted coverage of today.

While workers in the higher-paid industries, those who are the most skilled and the most strongly organized, have steadily increased their earnings, millions of their fellow citizens have been limited to the occasional improvements in the minimum wage voted by Congress. And 20 million other workers do not enjoy even this meager protection against low pay and long hours of work.

In the last 3 years alone, the typical worker in such industries as steel, auto, coal mining, and electrical equipment has gained 36 cents an hour in wages. Yet the legal minimum has remained at \$1.

Let me note in passing that repeated studies have shown that wage movements among the higher-paid and lower-paid workers are largely independent. The gains by the higher paid do not pull up the less fortunate; and increases among the lower paid, brought about by

legislation, have little impact on the others.

In effect, we have created a permanent depressed class in our working force. Whereas one group of American workers enjoys a wage structure based on such minimum rates as \$2.07 an hour, as in meatpacking, or \$2.01, as in the paper industry, or \$2.12 as in auto, and is protected against rising prices by escalator clauses, and receives additional benefits such as pensions and social insurance, another group is condemned to wages of \$1 or even less, and enjoy no auxiliary benefits at all.

These drastic differences are bad enough in themselves. What is even worse is the fact that \$1 an hour is too little to support a minimum standard of life in the United States today. I will document this point in greater detail in my later presentation to this body; it is enough at this time to ask the Members of this House to contemplate living on an income of \$40 a week or less.

The improvements proposed in my bill would deserve prompt and serious consideration even if they involved only the immediate victims of low wages. But there is a much broader application.

The economy of our Nation is based upon high production, high employment, and an ever-expanding national product. These, in turn, require a high level of consumer purchasing power. And that means an adequate minimum income for all Americans, not just a favored majority.

Consider the developments of the last few months, during which we have been recovering from last year's recession.

At first, all the economic indicators were pointing upward. There was widespread optimism. The upturn appeared to be brisk. But then it began to slow down. Unemployment, after a brief decline, is again on the rise. The next monthly figure will almost surely exceed 5 million.

Why is this so? Obviously it is not because we have produced too much for our needs; it is because so many millions of Americans can afford no more than the basic necessities of food, clothing, and shelter, and not enough of these.

Therefore, the plight of these unfortunate Americans—these forgotten people, who year after year have failed to share in our national progress—is not only a challenge to our conscience, but a threat to the economic welfare of us all.

Yet I do not want to pass over the moral side of this issue too lightly. We properly take pride that the United States is the leader and the showcase of the free world. Our most powerful answer to communism, among the underdeveloped peoples, is our own way of life—the fact that our free society has also produced the highest living standard in the world.

While we have in our own midst a depressed class numbering millions, whose members cannot hope to maintain a decent standard of living, our cause is immeasurably weakened.

There are privileged classes in the poorest of nations. Those in India and Africa whose need is for the barest necessities of life do not care how we treat our prosperous citizens. We will be

judged by our concern for the least among us.

Let me explain in general terms how my bill proposes to meet these problems.

First, as I said earlier, we propose to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25. This is surely a modest figure; it is barely more than half the average earnings of industrial workers as a whole, including the lowest-paid group.

Second, we propose to include some 7 million additional workers under the law's protection—7 million out of the 20 million presently excluded.

I shall submit at a later time an estimate of the numbers who would be affected in various types of businesses. The largest single group—more than half—are in the retail and service trades.

Let me say categorically that my bill will not impose a burden on the small merchant—the corner grocery, the strictly local establishment. The bill specifically excludes enterprises owned and operated by members of the same immediate family. And it excludes all others with gross sales of less than \$500,000 a year.

In other words, it excludes 97 percent of the Nation's retail businesses. But the remaining 3 percent employ one-third of the retail workers.

These are the giant chains that are best able to meet the modest terms of this bill—a \$1.25 minimum, a basic 40-hour week. And in this connection I would like to cite an interesting statistic.

A study by the Department of Labor in 1954 found that in these large chains—those with 11 or more stores—wages often were worse than in the neighborhood shops.

The proportion of workers earning less than \$1 an hour was highest in the big chains—the very operations that can afford to pay, and that give the small merchant his most severe competition.

Clearly, then, my bill not only excludes the small merchant; it would actually help him by forcing his giant rivals to meet fair wage standards.

The same is true in other categories I propose to include under the act. This is apparent in the bill itself, and will be explained in detail in my later discussion.

I also want to anticipate an argument that will be raised against this measure—that it is inflationary. There is no basis for such a fear.

The last two times the Congress has increased the minimum wage, it has instructed the Department of Labor to study the effects of the increase. These studies—one under a Democratic administration—were in general agreement. They found that the impact of a higher minimum was confined almost entirely to the lowest paid; that it had no significant effect on prices; that it had no harmful effect on employment or business solvency.

Another study, contained in a staff report of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, found that the full application of the Fair Labor Standards Act to retail business, even if the cost were wholly passed on to the consumer, would amount to an increase of one-half of 1 percent in the Consumer Price Index.

Even this brief summary, which has covered only a few of the major benefits involved, is enough, in my opinion, to demonstrate that this bill helps everyone, hurts no one, and is urgently necessary to the future welfare of America.

Finally, it should be noted that a separate bill is being introduced covering agricultural employment and it is hoped that simultaneous consideration will be given to this most important problem.

I am happy to say that Senator KENNEDY and Senator MORSE are introducing a similar measure in the other body.

In view of the lengthy hearings already held on this matter, it is my hope and belief that, without ignoring the importance of full consideration, hearings may be held to the minimum and action achieved at an early date.

I now introduce into the RECORD the text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis of its provisions.

A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the Act to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), is amended by inserting after subsection (a) a new subsection (b), to read as follows:

"(b) The Congress further finds that the existence, in retail trade or service and other industries engaged in activities affecting commerce, of labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers, has the effects set forth in subsection (a)."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is further amended by re-lettering subsection (b) as subsection (c).

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (j) of section 3 of such Act, defining the term "produced," is amended to read as follows:

"(j) 'Produced' means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this Act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any manner working on such goods, or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof in any State."

(b) Paragraph (m) of section 3 of such Act, defining the term "wage," is amended to read as follows:

"(m) 'Wage' paid to any employee includes the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary, to the employer, of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees. The Secretary is authorized to determine the fair value of such facilities for defined classes of employees and in defined areas, based on average value to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. Such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent,

shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wage paid to any employee."

(c) Section 3 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(p) 'American vessel' includes any vessel which is defined as a 'vessel of the United States' in title 18, United States Code, section 9, or which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States;

"(q) 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor of the United States Department of Labor;

"(r) 'Enterprise' means the related activities performed (either directly or indirectly through unified operation or common control or otherwise) by any person for a common business purpose of providing goods or services, or the products thereof, or a combination of them, to others, and includes all such activities whether performed in one or more establishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units;

"(s) 'Activity affecting commerce' includes any activity in commerce, necessary to commerce, or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by the Act, or the employment of child labor prohibited by this Act, burdens or obstructs or tends to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce;

"(t) 'Employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce' means an employer in any of the following categories who is engaged in any activity affecting commerce:

"(1) any enterprise where such employer has one or more retail establishments if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than \$500,000 or if the sales of such enterprise for resale or to customers who are engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least \$50,000 annually;

"(2) any enterprise where such employer has one or more service establishments if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than \$500,000 or if the sales of such enterprise to customers who are engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least \$50,000 annually;

"(3) any enterprise where such employer has one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning or repairing clothes or fabrics if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than \$250,000 or if the sales of such enterprise to customers who are engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least 15 percent of the gross volume of sales of such enterprise;

"(4) any enterprise where such employer is engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban, or interurban electric railway, trolley, or motorbus carrier;

"(5) any enterprise where such employer is engaged in the business of operating taxicabs if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than \$500,000;

"(6) any enterprise where such employer is engaged in the business of construction or reconstruction, or both, if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than \$50,000; or

"(7) any enterprise where such employer has one or more employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than \$50,000;

"Provided, That 'employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce' shall not include any retail or service enterprise in which the only employees are the owner of such enterprise and persons standing in the relationship of parent, spouse, or child of such owner."

SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEES FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of Labor shall as soon as practicable appoint a special industry committee to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 to employees in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, or in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or employed by an employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce, or the Secretary may appoint separate industry committees to recommend the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid under section 6 to employees therein engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or employed by an employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce in particular industries. An industry committee appointed under this subsection shall be composed of residents of such island or islands where the employees with respect to whom such committee was appointed are employed and residents of the United States outside of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. In determining the minimum rate or rates of wages to be paid, and in determining classifications, such industry committee shall be subject to the provisions of section 8."

MINIMUM WAGES

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "for commerce" and before the words "wages at" a comma and the following: "and every employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce shall pay to each of his employees".

(b) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out the figure "\$1.00" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$1.25".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be superseded in the case of any employee in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands or American Samoa engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce or employed by an employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce only for so long as and insofar as such employee is covered by a wage order heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee appointed pursuant to section 5: *Provided*, That every such employee in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands or American Samoa shall, on and after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959, be paid not less than the minimum wage rate or rates applicable to such employee under any wage order theretofore in effect, increased by the same number of cents per hour by which the minimum wage rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) pursuant to such amendments exceeds the rate theretofore in effect under such paragraph: *Provided further*, That such minimum wage rate or rates shall be in effect only for so long as and insofar as such minimum wage rate or rates has not been superseded by a wage order fixing a higher minimum wage rate or rates (but not in excess of the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a)) hereafter issued pursuant to the recommendations of an industry committee appointed pursuant to section 5."

MAXIMUM HOURS

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "for commerce" and before the words "for a workweek" a comma and the following: "and no employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce shall employ any of his employees".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out clause (3) thereof.

(c) Section 7 of such Act is further amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof.

WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words "for commerce" and before the words "is to reach" in the first sentence the following: "or in an activity affecting commerce"; and by inserting after the words "for commerce" and before the words "in any such industry" in the next to the last sentence the following: "or in an activity affecting commerce".

CHILD LABOR PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. Subsection (c) of section 12 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and no employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce shall employ any oppressive child labor."

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Subsection (a) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, or in the capacity of outside salesman (as such terms are defined and delimited by regulations of the Secretary); or (2) any employee employed by an establishment which qualifies as an exempt retail establishment by reason of not being included in subparagraph (1) of paragraph (1) of section 3, notwithstanding that such establishment makes or processes at the retail establishment the goods that it sells: *Provided*, That more than 85 per centum of such establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of goods so made or processed is made within the State in which the establishment is located; or (3) any employee employed in the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life, including the going to and returning from work and loading and unloading when performed by any such employee; or (4) any employee employed in agriculture or in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways, not owned or operated for profit, or operated on a share-crop basis, and which are used exclusively for supply and storing of water for agricultural purposes; or (5) any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted by regulations or orders of the Secretary issued under section 14; or (6) any switchboard operator who is providing telephone service through a telephone switchboard located in such operator's home; or (7) any individual employed within the area of production (as defined by the Secretary), engaged in handling, packing, storing, ginning, compressing, pasteurizing, drying, preparing in their raw or natural state, or canning of agricultural or horticultural commodities for market, or in making cheese or butter or other dairy products; or (8) any employee or proprietor in an establishment which qualifies as an exempt retail or service establishment by reason of not being included in subparagraph (1) or (2) of paragraph (1) of section 3 engaged in handling telegraphic messages for the public under an agency or contract arrangement with a telegraph company where the telegraph message revenue of such agency does not exceed \$500 a month; or (9) any employee employed as a seaman on a vessel other than an American vessel."

(b) Subsection (b) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The provisions of section 7 shall not apply with respect to (1) any employee of

an express company, sleeping car company, refrigerator car company, or carrier by railroad, subject to the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, or (2) any employee of a carrier by air subject to the provisions of title II of the Railway Labor Act; or (3) any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted under the provisions of subsection (e) of this section; or (4) any employee employed as an outside buyer of poultry, eggs, cream, or milk, in their raw or natural state."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The provisions of section 12, relating to child labor, shall not apply with respect to any employee employed in agriculture who is exempt under clause (4) of subsection (a) of this section, if such employee is employed outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while so employed, or to any employee employed as an actor or performer in motion pictures or theatrical productions, or in radio or television productions."

(d) Subsection (d) of section 13 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The provisions of sections 6, 7, and 12 shall not apply to any employee engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers at their residences: *Provided*, That section 12 shall not apply to any employee otherwise engaged in the delivery of newspapers to consumers when such employee is employed outside of school hours for the school district where such employee is living while he is so employed, and such employee is sixteen years of age or over."

(e) Section 13 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) For purposes of the application of sections 6 and 7 of this Act to any employee employed as a seaman on an American vessel, such employee shall be paid not less than the rate which will provide to such employee, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the minimum hourly rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6, or the overtime compensation rate prescribed in subsection (a) of section 7, or both, as may be appropriate, for all hours during such period when he was actually on duty (not including off-duty periods within such periods which are provided pursuant to the employment agreement or periods aboard ship when the employee was not, at the direction of a superior officer, either performing other work or standing by)."

PROHIBITED ACTS: PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE

SEC. 10. Section 15 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (c), to read as follows:

"(c) On and after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959, it shall be unlawful for any employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce to perform any act prohibited by, or omit to perform any act required by, subsection (a) of this section."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days from the date of its enactment.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1959

The proposed Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959 is a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, and to increase the minimum wage for employees under the act to \$1.25 an hour.

SECTION 1—SHORT TITLE

This section contains the title of the bill, "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1959."

SECTION 2—FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2 amends section 2 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "act") by adding to this section a new subsection (b) containing an additional congressional finding setting forth the need, in retail trade and service and other industries engaged in interstate commerce, of eliminating labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers. The present subsection (b) of section 2 of the act would be relettered as subsection (c).

SECTION 3—DEFINITIONS

Section 3 amends two of the definitions presently included in section 3 of the act and adds to this section of the act definitions of a number of new terms used in the bill.

Subsection (a) amends paragraph (j) of section 3, defining the term "produced." Under the present language of this paragraph, which was adopted in the 1949 amendments to the act, employees are deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if, among other things, they are employed in "any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production" of goods. Under the proposed amendment employees would be deemed to be engaged in the production of goods if they are employed in "any process or occupation necessary to the production" of goods.

Subsection (b) amends paragraph (m) of section 3 of the act, defining the term "wage," by adding to this definition standards to enable the Secretary of Labor to determine the fair value of board, lodging or other facilities customarily furnished by an employer to his employees. Such determinations could be for defined classes of employees and in defined areas and could be based on the average value to the employer or groups of employers similarly situated of furnishing to employees the facilities in question or the average value of such facilities to groups of employees, or on other appropriate measures of fair value. It is specified that such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent, shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wage paid to any employee for purposes of the act.

Subsection (c) adds eight new definitions to section 3 of the act:

A new paragraph (p) would define "American vessel," as used in the act, as including any vessel which is defined as a "vessel of the United States" in title 18, United States Code, section 9, or which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States;

Paragraph (q) specifies that "Secretary," as used in the act, means the Secretary of Labor of the United States Department of Labor;

Paragraph (r) defines the term "enterprise." This term is used in connection with extension of the minimum wage, overtime and child labor provisions to seven types of large enterprises on an employer basis, as set forth in the discussion of the proposed new paragraph (w) below. The term is defined as meaning related activities performed either directly or through unified operation or common control or otherwise, for a common business purpose of providing goods or services, or the products thereof, or a combination of them, to others, and includes all such activities, whether performed in one or more establishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units. Under this definition, the activities of the seven specified types of enterprises as employers of employees under the act are to be viewed as a whole in determining whether any such enterprise is en-

gaged in activities which bring its employees within the scope of the act;

Paragraphs (s) and (t) define the terms "actively affecting commerce" and "employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce." Under these definitions, an employee who is not technically engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce will nevertheless be covered if (1) he is employed by any one of seven types of enterprises defined in paragraph (t), and (2) such enterprise is engaged in an activity affecting interstate commerce, as defined in paragraph (s). Paragraph (s) defines the term "activity affecting commerce" as including any activity in commerce, necessary to commerce, or competing with any activity in commerce, or where the payment of wages at rates below those prescribed by the act, or the employment of oppressive child labor prohibited by the act, burdens or obstructs or tends to burden or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce. This definition is substantially the same as and is intended to provide coverage substantially similar to that provided under "affecting commerce" definitions used in the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended. Paragraph (t), which defines the term "employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce" specifies seven types of establishments to whose employees coverage under the act would be extended by the bill. Under this paragraph coverage is extended on an enterprise basis if the employer is engaged in an activity affecting commerce. This contrasts with the present tests of coverage which are on an employee basis and provide coverage only if the individual employee is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

The term "employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce" includes seven types of large enterprises whose sales exceed certain specified amounts, based for the most part on current jurisdictional standards being applied by the National Labor Relations Board in determining whether assertion of Board jurisdiction in specific cases would serve the purpose of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. The employees of such enterprises will be covered if the employer is engaged in an activity affecting commerce. These seven types of large enterprises are as follows:

1. Any enterprise where the employer has one or more retail establishments if the annual gross sales of such enterprise as a whole are not less than \$500,000 or if the sales of such enterprise for resale or to customers engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least \$50,000 annually.

2. Any enterprise where the employer has one or more service establishments if the annual gross sales of such enterprise as a whole are not less than \$500,000 or if the sales of such enterprise to customers engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least \$50,000 annually.

3. Any enterprise where the employer has one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothes or fabrics, if the annual gross sales of such enterprise as a whole are not less than \$250,000, or if the sales of such enterprise to customers engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, commercial, or communications business amount to at least 15 percent of the gross sales of the enterprise.

4. Any enterprise where the employer is engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban, or interurban transit system.

5. Any enterprise where the employer is engaged in the business of operating taxis if the annual gross business of such enterprise as a whole is not less than \$500,000.

6. Any enterprise where the employer is engaged in the building and construction industry if the annual gross business of such enterprise as a whole is not less than \$50,000.

7. Any enterprise where the employer has one or more employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce if the annual gross business of such enterprise as a whole is not less than \$50,000.

A proviso at the end of paragraph (w) specifies that so-called mom and pop shops are not to be covered. The term "employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce" specifically excludes any retail or service enterprise in which the only employees are the owner of such enterprise and a parent, spouse or child of such owner.

SECTION 4—SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEES FOR PUERTO RICO AND VIRGIN ISLANDS

This section makes changes in section 5 of the act, relating to the appointment of industry committees to recommend the minimum rates of wages to be paid under section 6 to employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, so as to give such committees jurisdiction over employees employed by any employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce, as well as over employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. Under the terms of subsection (c) of section 6 of the act, the same procedures which are applicable to the appointment of industry committees and the issuance of minimum wage orders for employees in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are applicable to employees in American Samoa.

SECTION 5—MINIMUM WAGES

Subsection (a) amends subsection (a) of section 6 of the act to make the minimum wage provisions apply not only to every employee engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also to every employee of every employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce, as defined in paragraph (w) of section 3 of the act, as amended. Certain exemptions continue to be provided for in section 13 of the act, as amended, but heretofore exempt employees will be entitled to be paid in accordance with section 6 of the act as amended, if they are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce unless such employees are specifically exempt from the application of such section under the provisions of subsections (a), (d), or (f) of section 13 of such act, as amended.

Subsection (b) amends paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of the act by raising the minimum wage under the act from \$1 to \$1.25 an hour.

Subsection (c) amends subsection (c) of section 6 of the act, applicable to the issuance of wage orders for employees in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and American Samoa, so that wage orders may be issued not only with respect to any such employees who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also with respect to any such employees who are employed by an employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce. A proviso is included in this section which specifies that the minimum wage rates applicable to any employee covered by a wage order heretofore in effect for employees in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands or American Samoa shall be increased by the same number of cents per hour as the minimum wage prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 is increased by the bill. Such minimum wage rate or rates, if less than the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) as amended, are to be in effect only for so long as and insofar as such minimum wage rate or rates are not superseded by a subsequent wage order issued in accordance with sections 5 and 8, as amended, fixing a higher minimum wage rate or rates, not in excess of the rate prescribed in paragraph (1) of subsection (a).

SECTION 6—MAXIMUM HOURS

Subsection (a) amends subsection (a) of section 7 to make the maximum hours provision of the act apply not only to non-exempt employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also to non-exempt employees employed by any employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce. Certain exemptions continue to be provided for in section 13 of the act, as amended, but heretofore exempt employees will be entitled to be paid in accordance with section 7 of the act if they are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce unless such employees are specifically exempt from the application of such section under the provision of subsections (a), (b), (d), or (f) of section 13 of the act, as amended.

Subsection (b) amends subsection (b) of section 7 of the act by striking from this subsection the so-called "seasonal industry" exemption contained in clause 3 of this subsection.

Subsection (c) amends section 7 by striking out the maximum hours exemptions applicable to employees engaged in certain specified agricultural handling and processing occupations contained in subsection (e) of such section.

SECTION 7—WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

This section amends section 8 of the act so that wage orders issued under the act with respect to employees in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa shall apply not only to employees in such islands who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also to any such employees who are employed by an employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce.

SECTION 8—CHILD-LABOR PROVISIONS

This section amends subsection (c) of section 12 of the act by providing that the child-labor provisions shall not only apply to employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce but also to employers engaged in activity affecting commerce. Certain exemptions continue to be provided for in section 13 of the act, as amended, but child labor which has heretofore been permitted will be prohibited under section 12, if the employer is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce unless such child labor is specifically exempt from such section under the provisions of subsection (c), (d), or (f) of section 13 of such act, as amended.

SECTION 9—EXEMPTIONS

Subsections (a) and (b) of this section rewrite and make the following changes in subsections (a) and (b) of section 13 of the act:

(a) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees employed in a local retailing capacity, presently contained in clause (1) of subsection (a), have been eliminated. The present exemptions for executive, administrative, and professional employees and for outside salesmen, however, are retained.

(b) Clauses (2) and (3) containing minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable to employees of retail, service and laundry, cleaning and repairing enterprises have been eliminated. The new coverage provisions specify the types of retail service and laundry, cleaning, and repairing enterprises that would be covered by the bill.

(c) Clause (5) has been amended to eliminate the present minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees engaged in packing or other processing of fish or seafood products. Fishing and other occupations which precede packing and processing of such products would, however, continue to be exempt.

(d) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees of weekly, semi-weekly, and daily newspapers contained in clause (8) have been eliminated.

(e) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees of street, suburban, and interurban transit systems contained in clause (9) have been eliminated. The new coverage provisions specify the types of enterprises engaged in the business of operating any such system that would be covered by the bill.

(f) Although overtime exemptions for employees engaged in certain agricultural processing occupations have been eliminated, as explained in the discussion of section 6 of the bill, supra, existing exemptions from the minimum wage and overtime provisions applicable to specified agricultural processing operations in the area of production contained in clause (10) have been retained.

(g) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable to certain telephone switchboard operators under clause (11) have been amended to apply only where the operator is providing telephone service through a telephone switchboard located in the operator's home.

(h) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees of employers engaged in the business of operating taxicabs contained in clause (12) have been eliminated. The new coverage provisions specify the types of enterprises engaged in the business of operating taxis that would be covered by the bill.

(i) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable under clause (14) to employees employed as seamen have been amended to apply only to seamen employed on vessels other than American vessels. A new subsection (g) is added to section 13 of the act, specifying the manner in which the minimum wage and overtime provisions are to be applicable to employees employed as seamen on American vessels.

(j) The minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable under clause (15) to employees of sawmills employing 12 or fewer employees have been eliminated.

(k) The overtime exemptions applicable to pipeline and trucking employees under clause (1) of subsection (b) of section 13 have been eliminated.

(l) The overtime exemptions applicable to canning of fish or seafood products under clause (4) of subsection (b) of section 13 have been eliminated.

(m) Employees in American Samoa subject to the provisions of subsection (e) of section 13 would be exempt from the overtime provisions under a new clause (3) of subsection (b) of section 13, as amended.

The bill continues the present minimum wage and overtime exemptions applicable to retail establishments that make or process the goods which they sell and to contract telegraph agencies maintained in exempt retail or service establishments where the telegraph message revenue of the agency does not exceed \$500,000 a month. It also retains the minimum wage and overtime exemption for employees employed in agriculture or in connection with nonprofit ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways used for supplying or storing water for agricultural purposes. Similarly, the minimum wage and overtime exemptions for employees covered by subminimum wage rates fixed by the Secretary under section 14 of the act for learners, apprentices, and handicapped workers is retained. Presumably the Secretary would proceed promptly to review these subminimum rates upon enactment of the higher minimum wage rate provided for in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of the act, as amended.

The various clauses of subsections (a) and (b) have been renumbered to take account of clauses which would be repealed.

Subsection (c) of section 9 amends subsection (c) of section 13 of the act to make

clear that the exemption from the child labor provisions applicable to children employed in agriculture is restricted to children employed in agricultural work which is exempt under clause (4) of subsection (a) of section 13, as amended. This exemption would apply only to children employed outside of school hours for the school district where such children are living while so employed.

Subsection (d) adds to subsection (d) of section 13 of the act a new proviso specifying that the child labor provisions shall not apply to any newspaper delivery employee, other than newsboys engaged in residential delivery of newspapers, if such employee is employed outside of school hours for the school district where the employee is living while he is so employed and the employee is 16 years of age or over.

Subsection (e) adds to section 13 of the act a new subsection (g) which provides that for purposes of the application of the minimum wage and overtime provisions to seamen employed on American vessels, such employees are to be paid not less than the rate which will provide to the employee, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the prescribed minimum wage rate or overtime rate, or both, as may be appropriate, for all hours during such period when the employee was actually on duty. This period, however, is not to include off-duty hours within such period which are provided pursuant to the employment agreement applicable to such employee or to periods aboard ship when the employee was not, at the direction of a superior officer, either performing other work or standing by.

SECTION 10—PROHIBITED ACTS: PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE

This section adds to section 15 of the act a new subsection (c) providing that the provisions of subsection (a) of this section declaring certain violations of the act and other actions of an employer to be unlawful when engaged in by such employer with respect to any employee engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce shall be applicable to every employer engaged in an activity affecting commerce with respect to any employee of an enterprise where the employer is so engaged.

SECTION 11—EFFECTIVE DATE

This section specifies that the act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of unemployment; are this Government's free trade policies contributing to the unemployment presently existing? Does the gentleman have any figures on that?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Such figures are available but I do not have sufficient time at my disposal to present them.

I believe sincerely that there are a great many industries which we could study and review, and there certainly are some things in our foreign policy that could be done. With those changes fewer American workers would be out of work. I can be very specific about it. I believe that a change in our foreign policy is necessary to enable Japanese goods in many instances to be sold in the United States because we do not allow Japan to sell them in Asia—I believe that change alone would put a great many Americans back to work. That is only one example. I believe our

whole foreign policy should be reconstituted wherever possible to see that that kind of competition does not hurt the American wage earner.

Mr. GROSS. How many of these underdeveloped countries are there left? I thought we had taken care of Japan, Germany, France, and Italy.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I have always believed in these reciprocal treaties but have felt they should be reciprocal in that these countries with which we have these treaties would work in every way to raise their standards of living to ours. Unless we can see progress in that field we are not being fair with our own workers.

Mr. GROSS. Was not one of the objects of the foreign aid program to raise the standard of living in the countries aided?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is correct, and great progress has been made in some of those countries.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman uses the phrase "underdeveloped countries"; are France and Britain considered to be underdeveloped? Is Italy supposed to be underdeveloped? Where are these underdeveloped countries of which the gentleman speaks?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think the gentleman will find that in Africa and Asia there are many underdeveloped countries, countries that for the first time are beginning to exercise the privilege of self-government, but countries where the standard of living needs to be raised.

Mr. GROSS. I understand there are some 50,000 people on the relief rolls in the District of Columbia and that there are at least 1,300 school children who cannot go to school regularly in the District of Columbia because they do not have shoes. Is this an underdeveloped area?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There are underdeveloped areas in this country.

Mr. GROSS. I am tired of hearing about underdeveloped areas in far-distant foreign countries.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am sure if the gentleman examines my bill he will find I am dealing exactly with that subject, the underdeveloped areas of this country. We want to improve the lot of the wage earners in this country to give them a decent standard of living.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. It was not my privilege to be on the floor and hear the gentleman's entire statement, but I did hear portions of it. I wonder if the gentleman can tell the House something about this: I have read newspaper articles from time to time although I have not been officially advised, that Mr. Reuther is making proposals similar to the one the gentleman has made here in the House and the Senator from Massachusetts is making in the Senate. Can the gentleman tell me whether the proposals made by himself and the Senator from Massachusetts are identical to Mr. Reuther's proposal or are there some differences?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No, sir; they are quite different. I do not know whether the gentleman heard me say this; but, No. 1, in this present bill there is no effort to cover the situation in the agricultural field; this is left out of this bill. I have said we hoped to cover it in a different bill a little later on, but it is not in this bill. There are a number of other substantial changes with respect to commerce, and so forth.

Mr. AVERY. I did hear the gentleman say that in his bill he had left out the small storekeeper, small business, and so on, and so forth. Can the gentleman make a categorical reference there?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. We call them the "mom and pop" stores.

Mr. AVERY. That definition belongs to the gentleman and I would not want to comment on that. But my question is this: Would the cost of living of the employees of that particular store be less than for the other employees the gentleman seeks to cover?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In general, I think so, because you will find, for instance, in the small store, the "mom and pop" store, that they do not have the same kind of working conditions, the same kind of problems. Many times a man and his wife will work together. If you impose this kind of regulation on them it would make it impossible for them to compete with the larger stores. At the same time it actually helps them as a family to get a better family income.

Mr. AVERY. I could not agree with the gentleman more, but I do not believe he has thought this proposal through to its ultimate conclusion. Even though he sets out certain exemptions, at the same time the proposal the gentleman makes or is going to make will be applicable to certain stores in the Middle West and will make it impossible for them to compete with the bigger stores, even though they may not be a large institution. They would not come in the category the gentleman mentions.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I think if the gentleman had given as much time and study to this whole subject as I have, and as our committee has, he would find out actually, as I pointed out in my statement, that that is not true. The competition largely comes from the big stores that are paying these depressed wages. The little stores perhaps with one or two people in general and on the average are paying more than the suggested minimum wage. They largely pay higher wages all along the line and we believe, so does the Department of Labor incidentally, that this competitive situation can be evened out or equalized, that competition will be encouraged and the little store will be given a greater opportunity to survive in our economy.

Mr. AVERY. That is a very interesting observation and again I must apologize for not being here when the gentleman started. The gentleman said, "We believe." He is referring to the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. To many of us on that committee, also to the testimony that has been given our committee by officials of the Department of Labor in the past.

Mr. AVERY. I might say parenthetically that I am anticipating serving on the Select Committee on Small Business. Has that committee taken any position on the gentleman's proposition?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. As far as I know, it has not taken a position on the question of minimum wages.

Mr. AVERY. It might be most appropriate for that committee to explore that field.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. There are provisions in the committee's resolution of authority providing that the Small Business Committee shall not undertake anything which other committees are investigating, and I think we would be ruled out on that score. Perhaps the gentleman would want to discuss that with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. AVERY. I certainly will, and I am glad to hear that particular rule being reemphasized on the floor here today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My understanding was, as the gentleman spoke earlier, that he thinks the trouble confronting us now is the inability of the average wage earner to purchase the necessities of life; therefore, we must increase that minimum wage, which applies only to a certain group.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I said I thought it was important to increase the purchasing power of that depressed part of the working population of this country so that they might in their turn contribute to the ability of our economy to expand, because if they have a decent wage they will be able to buy things which in turn by their purchases will enable others to have jobs.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Right there, if they get a decent wage they can buy?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is assuming the prices will not go up.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. No. I have referred specifically to the history of the previous increases in the minimum wage and in every instance it did not increase the price level; in every instance, even if you figured you would pass it on to the consumer, you would find out that the impact on the price level was less than one-half of 1 percent. You cannot go against history.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman trying to tell me that my dollar today will buy as much as it did 20 years ago?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I hope I am not that foolish. I am trying to tell the gentleman the past history of the effect of increasing the minimum wage in order to help the less fortunate workers of this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is theory, that is all it is. That is not experience.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. It is fact, and the able gentleman can find it in the testimony of the Department of Labor.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the present session of the Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 28 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. As is our custom, Mr. Speaker, we always mention this resolution, or at least I do, and have, I am sorry to say, for a great many years, at the time of the anniversary of Susan B. Anthony, which occurred on the 15th of February.

This year I received the following telegram from the President of the United States, which I will read into the RECORD at this point:

The women of America owe a special debt of gratitude to this beloved patriot. The men of America also hold her memory in highest regard. It was she who helped to provide us with a splendid array of full voting partners to share the burdens of leadership in the modern world. I am delighted to take part in this ceremony marking the 139th anniversary of her birth.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, for many years this resolution has been before the Congress, and for many years it has received good and great support from Members of the Congress. This year 41 Members of this House have introduced resolutions similar to House Joint Resolution 28.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that their names and the numbers of these resolutions be included at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The names and numbers are as follows:)

1. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, New York, Republican; House Joint Resolution 28; January 7, 1959.
2. GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 48; January 9, 1959.
3. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 63; January 9, 1959.
4. OREN HARRIS, Arkansas, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 83; January 9, 1959.
5. GORDON L. McDONOUGH, California, Republican; House Joint Resolution 92; January 9, 1959.
6. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania, Republican; House Joint Resolution 99; January 9, 1959.
7. ROBERT T. ASHMORE, South Carolina, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 108; January 12, 1959.
8. RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington, Republican; House Joint Resolution 131; Jan. 12, 1959.
9. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., New Jersey, Republican; House Joint Resolution 142; January 15, 1959.
10. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR., Alabama, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 145; January 15, 1959.
11. D. S. SAUND, California, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 148; Jan. 15, 1959.
12. RICHARD E. LANFORD, Maryland, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 162; Jan. 20, 1959.
13. EUGENE SILER, Kentucky, Republican; House Joint Resolution 170; January 20, 1959.

14. J. CARLTON LOSER, Tennessee, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 175; January 21, 1959.

15. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., Delaware, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 176; January 21, 1959.

16. OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 180; January 21, 1959.

17. FRANK T. BOW, Ohio, Republican; House Joint Resolution 183; January 22, 1959.

18. DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Maryland, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 195; January 27, 1959.

19. GERALD T. FLYNN, Wisconsin, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 199; January 29, 1959.

20. CATHERINE MAY, Washington, Republican; House Joint Resolution 206; February 2, 1959.

21. WILBUR D. MILLS, Arkansas, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 207; February 2, 1959.

22. WINT SMITH, Kansas, Republican; House Joint Resolution 210; February 2, 1959.

23. D. R. MATTHEWS, Florida, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 212; February 3, 1959.

24. JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona, Republican; House Joint Resolution 217; February 4, 1959.

25. HARLEY O. STAGGERS, West Virginia, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 219; February 4, 1959.

26. JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 220; February 4, 1959.

27. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, California, Republican; House Joint Resolution 222; February 5, 1959.

28. BYRON G. ROGERS, Colorado, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 223; February 5, 1959.

29. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 224; February 5, 1959.

30. HERMAN TOLL, Pennsylvania, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 225; February 5, 1959.

31. B. F. SISK, California, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 226; February 5, 1959.

32. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 227; February 9, 1959.

33. CLARK W. THOMPSON, Texas, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 230; February 9, 1959.

34. GARDNER R. WITHROW, Wisconsin, Republican; House Joint Resolution 231, February 9, 1959.

35. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska, Republican; House Joint Resolution 232; February 11, 1959.

36. A. S. HERLONG, JR., Florida, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 233; February 11, 1959.

37. JOHN E. MOSS, California, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 234; February 11, 1959.

38. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Wisconsin, Republican; House Joint Resolution 235; February 11, 1959.

39. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Michigan, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 240; February 12, 1959.

40. DALE ALFORD, Arkansas, Democrat; House Joint Resolution 242; February 16, 1959.

41. WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Florida, Republican; House Joint Resolution 245; February 16, 1959.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Also, this year, Mr. Speaker, we have 213 sponsors of this resolution, which is indeed a very goodly number, and I have no doubt that more names will come in. I ask, Mr. Speaker, unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD these names be also included.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The following 213 Members of the House of Representatives have requested that they be

listed as sponsors of the equal rights amendment in the 86th Congress:

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN, CARL ELLIOTT, GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

Arizona: JOHN J. RHODES, STEWART L. UDALL.

Arkansas: E. C. GATHINGS, WILBUR D. MILLS, JAMES W. TRIMBLE, OREN HARRIS, DALE ALFORD, W. F. NORRELL.

California: CLEMENT W. MILLER, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, JOHN E. MOSS, WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, CHARLES S. GUSSEY, JOHN J. MC FALL, B. F. SISK, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, HARLAN HAGEN, GORDON L. McDONOUGH, DONALD L. JACKSON, CRAIG HOSMER, H. ALLEN SMITH, EDGAR W. HESTAND, CLYDE DOYLE, GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, HARRY R. SHEPPARD, D. S. (Judge) SAUND, BOB WILSON.

Colorado: BYRON G. ROGERS, J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

Connecticut: DONALD J. IRWIN, ROBERT N. GIALMO, CHESTER BOWLES.

Delaware: HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

Florida: WILLIAM C. CRAMER, ROBERT L. F. SIKES, DANTE B. FASCELL, A. S. HERLONG, JR., PAUL G. ROGERS, JAMES A. HALEY, D. R. MATTHEWS.

Idaho: GRACIE PFOST.

Illinois: WILLIAM L. DAWSON, EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, HAROLD R. COLLIER, CHARLES A. BOYLE, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, LESLIE C. ARENDS, ROBERT H. MICHEL, EDNA OAKES SIMPSON, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, KENNETH J. GRAY, ROLAND V. LIBONATI.

Indiana: E. ROSS ADAIR, WILLIAM G. BRAY, RANDALL S. HARMON.

Iowa: FRED SCHWENGEL, H. R. GROSS, MERWIN COAD, CHARLES P. HOEVEN.

Kansas: WILLIAM H. AVERY, NEWELL A. GEORGE, DENVER D. HARGIS, WINT SMITH, EDWARD H. REES.

Kentucky: WILLIAM H. NATCHER, BRENT SPENCE, JOHN C. WATTS, CARL D. PERKINS, EUGENE SILER.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HEBERT, OTTO E. PASSMAN.

Maine: CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE.

Maryland: DANIEL B. BREWSTER, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, GEORGE H. FALLON, RICHARD E. LANFORD, JOHN R. FOLEY, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

Massachusetts: SILVIO O. CONTE, EDWARD P. BOLAND, PHILIP J. PHILBIN, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, JAMES A. BURKE.

Michigan: GERALD R. FORD, JR., CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, ALVIN M. BENTLEY, ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, VICTOR A. KNOX, CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD.

Minnesota: JOSEPH E. KARTH.

Missouri: W. R. HULL, JR., A. S. J. CARNAHAN, MORGAN M. MOULDER.

Nebraska: PHIL WEAVER, GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

Nevada: WALTER S. BARING.

New Hampshire: CHESTER E. MERROW.

New Jersey: PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., FLORENCE P. DWYER, WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

New Mexico: JOSEPH M. MONTOYA.

New York: STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, FRANK J. BECKER, ALBERT H. BOSCH, LESTER HOLTZMAN, JAMES J. DELANEY, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, JOHN H. RAY, ADAM C. POWELL, ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, LEONARD FARBERSTEIN, HERBERT ZELENKO, JAMES C. HEALEY, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, PAUL A. FINO, EDWIN B. DOOLEY, ROBERT R. BARRY, J. ERNEST WHARTON, LEO W. O'BRIEN, DEAN P. TAYLOR, SAMUEL S. STRATTON, ALEXANDER PRINIE, JESSICA MCC. WEIS, HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, WILLIAM E. MILLER, JOHN R. PILLION, DANIEL A. REED, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE.

North Carolina: RALPH J. SCOTT, ALTON LENNON.

North Dakota: DON L. SHORT.

Ohio: GORDON H. SCHERER, JAMES G. POLK, JACKSON E. BETTS, A. D. BAUMHART, JR., WILLIAM H. AYRES, JOHN E. HENDERSON, FRANK T. BOW, ROBERT W. LEVERING, WAYNE L. HAYS.

Oklahoma: PAGE BELCHER, ED EDMONDSON, TOM STEED, JOHN JARMAN, TOBY MORRIS.

Pennsylvania: WILLIAM A. BARRETT, JAMES A. BYRNE, HERMAN TOLL, WILLARD S. CURTIN, PAUL B. DAGUE, IVOR D. FENTON, ALVIN R. BUSH, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, JOHN P. SAYLOR, CARROLL D. KEARNS, FRANK M. CLARK, THOMAS E. MORGAN, JAMES G. FULTON, ROBERT J. CORBETT, ELMER J. HOLLAND.

South Carolina: L. MENDEL RIVERS, ROBERT T. ASHMORE.

South Dakota: GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, E. Y. BERRY.

Tennessee: JOE L. EVINS, J. CARLTON LOSER, CLIFFORD DAVIS.

Texas: WRIGHT PATMAN, BRUCE ALGER, OLIN E. TEAGUE, JOHN DOWDY, CLARK W. THOMPSON, FRANK IKARD.

Utah: HENRY ALDOUS DIXON.

Virginia: RICHARD H. POFF, HOWARD W. SMITH, W. PAT JENNINGS, JOEL T. BROYHILL.

Washington: THOMAS M. PELLY, JACK WESTLAND, RUSSELL V. MACK, CATHERINE MAY, WALT HORAN, THOR C. TOLLEFSON.

West Virginia: ARCH A. MOORE, JR., HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, ELIZABETH KEE.

Wisconsin: GERALD T. FLYNN, GARDNER R. WITTHROW, HENRY S. REUSS, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, LESTER R. JOHNSON, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.

Wyoming: KEITH THOMSON.

Hawaii: JOHN A. BURNS.

Puerto Rico: ANTONIO FERNOS-ISERN.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring your thoughts back to Susan B. Anthony and to some of the things that she stood for and to some of the reasons for this resolution.

It may seem incredible today, but it is nevertheless true that Susan B. Anthony was tried on June 18, 1873. The crime with which she was charged, and for which she was duly sentenced, was that she had voted illegally and in defiance of the 14th amendment to the Constitution.

The judge at that time was careful to point out that the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments were written into the Constitution to safeguard the rights of the recently enfranchised Negroes. But, he pointed out with care that these amendments were based on the words: "The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." He pointed out that the word "sex" was omitted and that therefore, in his opinion, women did not have the right to vote.

All this happened less than 100 years ago and as I said before, Mr. Speaker, today it seems incredible and slightly ridiculous.

And yet, as we examine the Constitution today, we nowhere find that women have been given equality under the law. True they have been given the right to vote through the passage of the 19th amendment and that great step forward has perhaps spelled complete equality to those taking a superficial view of the situation.

To give but a few cases of inequality before the law, which in many peoples' opinion will never be corrected until

women are made equal under the law through a constitutional amendment:

In some of our States women cannot serve on juries. In one State, the separate property of a wife, owned at the time of marriage, is divided into dotal and extradotal. Dotal property, or dowry, is that which the wife brings to the husband to assist him in bearing the expenses of the marriage establishment. The husband is under no such obligation. The income from this dotal property belongs to the husband. He has the administration of the dowry, and although it was originally the wife's property, she cannot deprive him of this right.

In eight States the husband must join with the wife in order to make a valid conveyance.

Recognition in common law of the husband as the sole support, without recognition of the wife's services as part of that support, is unsound. Recognition of the wife's contribution would strengthen the family as a unit. The husband would no longer enjoy special status as the sole provider even when the wife was also earning.

Women occupy a secondary position as parents in 14 States which give preference to the father as guardian of the minor children. Unequal marital status under State laws affects property rights, right to operate own business, and right to control own earnings. The amendment would force States to bring their laws into line within a certain period.

Progress has made protective legislation for women obsolete. Such legislation operates to the disadvantage of women in many cases where employment preferences and overtime are involved. Many State laws discriminate against women under the guise of safety and welfare legislation. Women can now protect themselves by organization.

The amendment would encourage a revision of State labor laws along more realistic lines, based on the nature of the work rather than the sex of the worker. Safety and health regulations should apply to both men and women. Adult working women are entitled to use their judgment as to hours and type of work.

Social insurance systems which fail to grant equal benefits to the family of a woman worker are unjust. Equalization would give greater justice to husbands, wives, and children.

Might I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the husbands of Members of Congress are not entitled to the same rights as the wives of Members of Congress, which is another injustice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that once again we are going to hear sobs and groans over the cruel destruction of protective legislation for women.

Again, at the risk of repeating what I have said many times before on the floor of this House, there has been, and I trust always will be, special legislation for various groups of citizens. This does not deprive them of equality under the Constitution. Veterans have special legislation which applies only to them. The sick, the aged, the poor, the blind—all have special legislation apply-

ing only to them. Today students are the recipients of many benefits under special legislation. None of these groups are deprived of their rights under the Constitution for this reason, and it is absurd and hypocritical to pretend that this amendment would mean the end of special and necessary legislation and laws applicable to women.

Just as a woman cannot be a veteran in the sense that she has not shouldered a gun, neither can a man give birth to a child, and he certainly, therefore, is not entitled to maternity benefits.

It is also funny, but not factual, that every time some opponents of the measure, with more humor than brains, see a picture of some Russian crone cleaning the streets of Moscow they rush to the protagonists of the amendment, saying: "Ah, here you have equality." Well, Mr. Speaker, the day our women clean the streets, our men will be in slave labor camps, and personally I would prefer to clean the streets.

No, Mr. Speaker, there are reasons, and one of the principal reasons is that there are people in this country who do not want to see women get equal pay for equal work. I do not believe that they ever will get equal pay for equal work until they are first-class citizens under the Constitution.

The excuse of protective legislation is very thin indeed. When it comes to actual strength and longevity, it is a well known fact that women are stronger and live longer than men. It is a very sad fact but it is a true one. No, the old saying that the female of the species is more deadly than the male is actually a true, and not a very cheering, thought.

Women do need equality. Women do need to be paid for what they do, and to be paid in full if they do the same work and do it as well. That is not the case in our country today.

I know many people who object to this amendment on both sides of the aisle. May I point out here that this is not a partisan matter. The equal rights amendment has been in both party platforms for a number of years, so there is no partisanship whatsoever in this matter. That will be well demonstrated by the list of sponsors and the list of Members introducing identical amendments.

No, as a matter of fact it is time that we at least gave the States the right to pass on this amendment. What are we so afraid of? That is my question always. Why are we afraid, when we give women so much in this country, to at least allow them equality under the Constitution, which incidentally, if that Constitution had been written within the last 20 years, they would have obtained automatically? The only reason it is not so is that our Constitution is the oldest written constitution in the world, and at the time it was originally written and conceived women were merely chattels under the British common law and under the law of our own country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 139th anniversary of the birth of a baby girl who became one of the foremost women of her time, Susan B. Anthony. Today I would like to join with an honored lady of our time, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE], in supporting her resolution that proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. She is to be commended for her leadership in the efforts to insure equal rights for the men and women of our country, and I am happy to have been associated with her on this matter in past Congresses and in this Congress. It is hoped that in this 86th Congress the work started by Miss Anthony for equal rights will meet with success and the amendment presented to the States for approval.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], may extend her remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, we are here today, once again, urging action on a resolution which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women. For 36 years this proposed amendment has been pending before Congress.

The equal-rights amendment has only one aim—to raise women in this great country of ours to the status of full and equal citizenship. Since the beginning of our Republic, women have been relegated to an inferior position with respect to their citizenship.

Our democratic faith is certainly strong enough, our economic system dynamic enough, and our sense of fair play elastic enough to make women full citizens.

It is tragic that our democracy should be imperfect in that we tolerate discrimination against women solely because of sex. We would not for a moment accept discriminatory practices based on color of eyes or hair. Inferior treatment of women is just as senseless. The best way to correct this unfair practice is by adoption of the equal-rights amendment. Such action is long overdue.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, as a co-author of this amendment, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York. I believe she has made a very specific and intelligent statement on this very important amendment to the Constitution.

As a consistent sponsor of the equal-rights amendment, I have urged that women be accorded their full equality with men in every phase of business, professional, and domestic activity, and that they be accepted to full partner-

ship in the duties and responsibilities of the government of our Nation, both on the national and the local level. I have also urged the adoption of the equal-rights amendment, as proposed in House Joint Resolution 92 which I introduced, which would render all laws discriminating against women because of their sex null and void.

We have recognized the equal rights of human beings to live and work in a Nation where they will not face discrimination because of race, color, and creed, and even now seek legislation to strengthen the guarantee against discrimination. But we have ignored discrimination against women because of their sex. And we will never achieve our goal of equal rights for all our citizens until we have removed all existing discrimination against women and adopted the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution to assure women of their equal rights under the law of the land.

I further support the equal-rights amendment because it would write into the Federal Constitution a permanent dependable bill of rights for women.

It would wipe out common-law interpretation and bring women under the full protection of the Constitution.

It would be a mandate to the States to bring their laws into line within 3 years.

It would encourage a revision of State labor laws along more just and realistic lines, based on the nature of the work and not on the sex of the worker.

It would effectively back up equal pay legislation.

It would protect women from discriminatory legislation in the future.

It recognizes women as human beings and responsible citizens and as such entitled to share with men freedom and equality both of which are necessary for human development.

It is in harmony with American ideals of freedom, equality, and justice.

It is in harmony with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

It would give our Government unquestionable authority to sign international conventions affirming the equal rights of men and women.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentlewoman for making this very interesting and factual talk to the House of Representatives. As our colleague knows, I have had the high honor and pleasure of introducing her amendment, the equal rights amendment for the women of our country. It is such an obvious thing that I just cannot understand why it has not long since been passed. I certainly want to assure the gentlewoman that I am going to continue my interest and cooperation. I surely hope that she will be successful in soon seeing this great ambition of hers come to pass, and that is that equal rights for women become an indelible part of the Constitution of the United States.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. I know that with his help we will get a lot further.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE]. She has given this very fine piece of legislation 11 years of service. As a new Member of this body, I want to state that long before coming here I heard of her work in this field. It is true, as she has indicated, that women's groups throughout the United States with ever-increasing interest are giving their support to it as they have learned to better understand the overall effect of this equal rights amendment. Distinguished groups of women such as the Business and Professional Women, the Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Women's Party are backing this equal rights amendment. But, in addition, I think I would like to repeat, as Mrs. St. GEORGE has pointed out, that service groups and men's groups throughout the country are also bringing a new interest to it as they understand it. Our distinguished colleague, as has already been indicated, has introduced this amendment for 11 years now, I believe it is, and certainly we can hope that this year, perhaps, our Members in the Congress will take a fresh new look at it. It sometimes happens that a position taken on a certain matter in the past becomes a stand that one does not move from until all at once the time comes when you say to yourself "Let us take a new look at this." This, of course, is what our distinguished colleague from New York is pleading that we do today. Certainly, the excuses and arguments that have been made against this legislation in the past under close scrutiny have become worn and threadbare and if given intelligent discussion and consideration prove to be very weak indeed.

I commend my distinguished colleague again for the great fight she has made in this field. I, too, have joined in sponsoring a copy of her bill and am very proud to stand by her side as a new Member in this body, in an effort to have it given consideration.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the lady from Washington and I appreciate her support.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. In a number of States, as in Iowa, we have divorce laws which are more favorable to the women in a divorce case than to the man in a divorce case. I have said on many occasions, and I still hold to that position, that I, like I think everyone to whom I have spoken about this matter agrees, want equal pay for women for equal work. But we are concerned about a Federal law which would repeal State laws such as we have in Iowa, which are

more favorable to women in alimony cases than to men.

Would the gentlewoman, for whom I have the highest regard, speak on that subject?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I would be delighted to do so.

May I tell the gentleman from Iowa first of all that I do not entirely agree with him. I have always been in favor of a national divorce law. My personal opinion, for what it is worth, is that our divorce laws are an absolute shambles. I also think that the alimony racket in this country, where of course the man is usually penalized, is also very bad and very unfair. I am glad that my colleague brought this question up, because that is one of the points that I am afraid has not been sufficiently cleared. This amendment is entitled "Equal Rights for Men and Women." It is not just for women. The only reason that women play such a part in the amendment is that they are the ones, presumably, who do not have equal rights. But here again there are some fields in which men do not have equal rights. I am fully cognizant of that. Having worked on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have seen many cases where the word "widow" was in a bill but never the word "widower." I have always wanted to see in this country, rather than the "quicky" divorces, which can be obtained in a great many States, and which incidentally are a very profitable business for some of those States, a national divorce law that would be safe and sound.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think that speaking generally men favor equal rights for women. I think that is a fair statement. I have always said that, and I have heard that same thing said by many, many men. Without doubt, that is why the States have passed divorce laws which were more favorable to women than to men. As the lady knows, generally speaking, if there are children involved in a divorce proceeding, the children will adhere closer to the mother than to the father. I think perhaps that is why the State legislatures have felt that the women were entitled to more consideration in divorce proceedings than were the men. I want to vote for the equal-rights amendment but when I look at the laws of my State—and we still have State sovereignty where the States have the privilege of passing laws which affect their people—I hesitate to agree to vote for an equal rights amendment which would repeal the benefits which the women have in my State relative to alimony. It is a difficult thing to do, as I see it. I am going to be very frank with the gentleman and say that no one has yet given me a reason, a good reason, a reason that I can expound to the people I have the honor to represent in Congress, a reason for voting for the Federal equal rights amendment which would repeal the benefits which my State gives the women in divorce laws.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I do not

know whether the gentleman heard what I said in that respect. I pointed out that there would always be special legislation, I trust, for special classes of citizens. That, of course, would include women; it would include men. I pointed out that there is special legislation right now and there will continue to be special legislation for veterans, for students, for the poor, for the handicapped, for all manner of citizens; they have special legislation. There is no doubt that certain of this special legislation would apply only to women such as the maternity benefits, and so forth; and there is no reason why they should, because of that, be declared second-class citizens. I agree the same thing would apply in the gentleman's State, for instance, to divorce laws: In my State of New York they are totally different from the divorce laws in the gentleman's State; they are certainly very different from the divorce laws in the State of Nevada and many others. The law in the States could not be transformed everywhere, and certainly this amendment would in no wise transform it in any way.

The gentleman says he believes that men in general in the United States are in favor of giving women more rights and more privileges. To a certain extent that is true, but it is true only of a favored few. I know a great many men who shudder at, and who do not like the idea at all—and they are in very, very high places in labor—of giving women equal pay for equal work. They fear the competition of women in the labor market; and there is perhaps some good reason for that fear, in view of the unemployment problems we have today. But I very much fear that this idea of giving equal pay for equal work before giving full equality under the Constitution is merely, to speak frankly, putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, I can assure the gentleman, and I can assure everyone within the sound of my voice or in this great land of ours, that I am for a bill which will give equal rights to the women for equal work. I only wish that would be as far as the gentleman's bill would go. I would hope that we would not need to pass Federal law which would repeal State laws which are so favorable to women. It is my position. I just cannot help it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I think his fears are groundless. The amendment is very simple and, as the gentleman well knows, it will have to be passed by three-quarters of the States. It will have to run the full gantlet and the States themselves will make the decision as to whether there is danger to them and to their special legislation under this amendment. I personally would not have introduced the amendment if I believed such would be the case. I cannot find it is, in any of my studies, and I assure the gentleman they have been long and arduous.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 139th anniversary of the birthday of Susan Brownell Anthony, it is fitting that we should pause for a few moments to pay her tribute as the one person, from a field of many who fought in the same cause, who truly gave her life for the sake of gaining for members of her sex equal privileges and rights under the Law.

It is, of course, debatable whether Miss Anthony can be listed as the mother of the suffrage movement. We remember that the daughter of Lord Calvert and niece of Lord Baltimore, Miss Margaret Brent, made quite a vociferous case in 1647 that she be allowed "place and voice" in the Maryland Assembly. Likewise, Abigail Adams gave her husband John a little lecture before he went off to the Continental Congress in 1776, admonishing him to be a good deal more considerate of the fair sex in drawing up the laws of the new Nation than his forefathers had been. It would thus seem that the tendency of women to actively bother about their political status dates back at least to the beginnings of our beloved Republic.

It is, however, scarcely debatable that Susan B. Anthony did more, more vigorously, to create a national women's movement than any of her predecessors or her contemporaries. Although Lucretia Mott presided over the first Washington convention of the suffragettes 90 years ago this winter, and though Elizabeth Cady Stanton was elected first president of the National American Women's Suffrage Movement—which combined two smaller groups—even these two women, who were her friends, admitted that it was Miss Anthony who was the wit and intellect, the energy and fire that caused the movement to grow into a meaningful force for women's rights.

She did indeed have a quick wit. She was one of the few persons, whether male or female, ever to silence, however temporarily, the sharp-tongued Horace Greeley. At a New York meeting just after the close of that period which some refer to as "the recent unpleasantness," Susan Anthony was found speaking out for equal voting rights for women. Greeley remarked that the ballot went with the bullet, and inquired of Miss Anthony whether she would be willing to fight to have this right. She immediately replied: "Yes, Mr. Greeley, just as you fought in the late war, at the end of a goose quill."

Susan Anthony it was also who almost broke up a suffragette movement once by rising on the convention floor and sharply reminding the sweet-voiced lecturer that although the lady had the undoubted right to address the group, she had better speak up and be heard or she would find herself without an audience.

She was, of course, not just a courageous and quick debater. Her courage took other, perhaps more significant, forms. She went to jail once for the crime of voting. And I think it must have taken some courage to turn down the several marriage proposals she is said to have received as the result of her comeliness and intelligence.

She chose her cause, believed in her cause, fought resolutely in that cause, and, sadly, died before she realized that the fight had not been in vain. Just 14 years after death came to her in 1906, in her 86th year of life, the 19th amendment to the Constitution was proclaimed to be in effect by the Secretary of State on August 26, 1920, and thereby was gained for all American women the privilege and right to cast their ballots in all subsequent elections.

It is right, as I have said, that we should pause to honor the memory of Susan B. Anthony with our well-meant but feeble words. I wonder, however, Mr. Speaker, if it would not be more of a tribute to her, and to the women of America whose cause she so nobly espoused, if we gave thought to the fact that even today the rights of women are not fully protected by law; that in such areas as Federal employment, women still do not receive equal consideration with men; and facing up to that fact, would it not be more of a tribute if we let our actions speak louder than our words ever could in honor of Susan B. Anthony and the American woman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleague from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] in paying special tribute today, as has the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], to Susan B. Anthony. While some of us in this body, Mr. Speaker, may feel some of the reservations of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] with respect to the actual effect of the gentleman's resolution, I think all of us join in sharing her determination to carry on the fight against discrimination which Susan B. Anthony fought so effectively and so long. As a graduate of the University of Rochester with which Susan B. Anthony was so long connected, and which has many great memorials to her, I desire to join with my colleagues in this body in paying tribute to that great American woman, who fought so long and successfully for the 19th amendment to the Federal Constitution. Miss Anthony spent many of the years of her active life in Rochester, N.Y., and contributed immensely to the cultural life of that great city and also to the great University of Rochester which is located there.

As an undergraduate at Rochester I learned early of the great work for which Miss Anthony was famous. As we pause today to pay tribute to her, Mr. Speaker, and to her fight for an end to discrimination by reason of sex, may we also dedicate ourselves to continuing the great fight for full equality for American women which Susan B. Anthony so nobly advanced.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the birthday anniversary of Susan B. Anthony. It would be no exaggeration to say that every woman who holds a job, who goes to college, who is a doctor, lawyer, scientist, professor; every mother who has equal guardianship of her children; every woman who controls her own property, her own wages; every woman who votes or holds office, owes a debt of gratitude to Susan B. Anthony, which never can be repaid.

Born on a farm near Adams, Mass., she was a pioneer in more than the suffrage movement. She was for justice alike for both sexes and all colors and races.

Courage and determination are New England traits, and it took tremendous courage for Miss Anthony to persist when even many of the women for whom she was fighting turned their backs on her. She appeared on the American scene at a time when the cause she championed was not only unpopular among men but among women as well. It was for her to kindle the spark of public opinion in favor of the cause of woman suffrage. It is said that public opinion is one of the great factors in America, and when it is refined by the fire of full and free discussion, it becomes a wholesome expression of the views of the people.

It was in 1872 that she cast her ballot at the New York State and congressional elections in Rochester to test the application of the 14th and 15th amendments of the Constitution of the United States. For this she was indicted for illegal voting and was fined, but the fine was never exacted.

Her last notable appearance was as a delegate to the International Council of Women in London, England, in the year 1899. In 1900 there was a great popular demonstration in our Nation's Capital in celebration of her birthday, and in that year she retired from the presidency of the National American Women's Suffrage Association which office she had held for a great number of years.

Susan B. Anthony changed the mind of our Nation. More than anyone of her time she changed the fabric of our civilization by improving the status of women—politically, socially, economically. While she neither began nor ended woman's struggle for equality, she left upon the movement the stamp of an imperishable personality. One might say she is the mother of all enfranchised women in the world today.

An obscure schoolteacher, at the age of 33, she vowed to change the mind of man concerning the degraded position of women. Until the day of her death, she never faltered in her determination to win equality for women.

In her last speech, Miss Anthony left as a memorial to her efforts, the following words of wisdom:

When will men see that what we ask is not praise but justice?

This last speech concluded with these words: "Failure is impossible."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, February 15, 1959, marks the 139th anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony. This great lady appropriately may be called an apostle of freedom. She brought to this Nation a vision of a new and enlarged sphere for women in social, economic, and political life. To that cause she unselfishly, effectively, and with rare persistence and ability devoted her life. The years have rewarded her efforts. Her memory and fame have remained through the decades as a symbol of those who have become the common assets of a nation.

I would like to sketch briefly her career and tell you something of the times in which she lived. Susan B. Anthony was born February 15, 1820, in the small New England town of Adams, Mass., where her father owned a cotton mill. Later the family moved to western New York, and in Rochester Susan spent most of her young womanhood and old age.

The Anthonys were people of liberal minds and Susan was given as good an education as girls usually received in those days. This was less than a child now receives in the fifth grade of a public school, and when Susan demanded to be taught long division and algebra she had to find a private tutor.

When she was 17 her father lost all of his property in the panic of 1837. Teaching being the only job open to girls of her social class, Susan became a teacher, and her first indignation against the degraded position of women was when she found that she had to accept \$2.50 a week for doing work for which a man was paid \$10 a week. She also discovered that the little money she earned was not legally her own, if her father chose to claim it—which happily Mr. Anthony did not. She found when she looked around her that women were practically enslaved. A married woman could own no property, even if it were inherited or a gift. If she worked—and many women did work, sewing, washing and ironing, and taking boarders—her earnings all belonged to her husband. Worse than this, she had no control over her children, for they belonged by law to the father. A married woman could not testify in courts of law, could not sue or be sued. She could not make a will giving away even her personal effects. No woman, married or unmarried, had any way of protesting against such injustice, for women were barred from public platforms.

Susan B. Anthony broke the first taboo by daring to speak at a convention of the New York State Teachers' Association. No woman had ever asked to be heard before, but the men, by a majority of one, voted that she might speak. After that she made speeches advocating the most modern ideas in education, the admission of girls to high school and college, coeducation, promotion of women teachers to higher positions, equal pay for equal work, and, above all, equal educational opportunities for children regardless of sex.

Until she was past 30, educational reform occupied her entire attention outside the schoolroom. But in July 1848 there was a convention in the village of

Seneca Falls, N.Y., the first woman's rights convention in the history of the world. Susan did not attend the convention, but she read of it. She saw that what she had to do was to change the mind of the whole Nation in regard to the position of women and bravely she set herself to do it.

Those today who are working for social advances, and who are often weary and heartsick because their ideas are not immediately realized, would do well to study the life of this woman, who never grew weary, never lost faith, never stopped working. At 70 years of age, 75 and 80, and beyond, she continued to travel all over the United States, lecturing, organizing, taking part in every campaign for woman suffrage. She welcomed the four Western States that in her lifetime gave women the vote, but she always believed that woman's enfranchisement should be written into the Constitution of the United States. Toward that end she worked until her death.

Susan B. Anthony's work was not in vain, for 14 years after her death, on August 26, 1920, the 19th amendment was proclaimed in effect.

It is eminently fitting that one from Maryland pay tribute to Susan B. Anthony. Maryland was named for a woman. Her capital city was named for a woman. It was in Maryland in 1649 that Mistress Margaret Brent demanded place and voice in the assembly as the executrix and representative of her kinsman, Lord Baltimore. Her petition was denied, but she must have had some gallant supporters, as Maryland history records that the question of her admission was hotly debated.

It was not until some 200 years later that the demand for full equality for women was made again in Maryland—this time by that peerless leader, Miss Anthony herself, who lectured in Baltimore in the early 1870's. Immediately associations were set up throughout the State to carry on the fight and these groups proved strong factors in the final ratification of the 19th amendment.

In fitting tradition, Maryland takes her rightful place in urging the adoption of the equal rights amendment so that henceforth, women shall have at last, a place and voice; so that henceforth the law of this land shall be, in the immortal words of Susan B. Anthony, "man's rights and nothing more, woman's right and nothing less."

I urge the Members of the 86th Congress to give to the women of this Nation equal opportunity. I have said on the floor of this House previously, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat, that if two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate approve the equal rights amendment the citizens of our 49 States will have the opportunity to make the final decision by ratification. Approval of 36 States will add to the Constitution an amendment which goes hand in hand with the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. It will provide that equality of right shall not be denied by the United States or any State on account of sex.

In paying tribute to Susan B. Anthony, I pay tribute to all women. It is an inspiration to all of us, and a refreshing experience, to turn our attention to a woman who did so much to give us the right to call ourselves a democracy. We can do no less than to follow her sound advice.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we pause briefly to pay grateful tribute to the memory of one of the great women of American history, Susan B. Anthony, and I would not want the day to pass without adding my own sentiments to those which have already been expressed.

Susan B. Anthony lived the greater part of her life in my home city of Rochester, N.Y., and though it has now been a little over 52 years since her death, I can assure you that her memory continues to burn brightly in the heart of virtually every woman in our community.

Each year numerous women's organizations throughout western New York celebrate the birthday of Susan Anthony, and last week it was my privilege to attend two of these anniversary meetings, one at the restored home of Miss Anthony in Rochester, and the other in Buffalo. I was asked to speak briefly at the meeting in Buffalo, to the women of the Interclub Council of Western New York, and I would like to include portions of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN A CHANGING WORLD (Excerpts from speech of Representative JUDY WEIS to Interclub Council of Western New York, Feb. 14, 1959)

Susan Anthony was one of the great dynamic leaders of America, and she possessed in abundance all the great attributes of a crusader. Into her character were woven those traits that triumph over all difficulties and discouragements. A will as stubborn as twisted steel. A determination that scorned denial. A soul sensitive to every injustice and tyranny over mind and soul. A courage that counted no costs. A creed that acknowledged responsibility only to her conscience and her God. In all of American history she has few equals as a moral leader, and in her life and her work there is a wonderful example for all of us.

In the same way that we pause to honor Susan Anthony, it seems to me that it is also important that we pause occasionally to take stock of what women have accomplished in these 52 years since her passing.

They have been truly great years for us, and I think it is encouraging to women everywhere to take a good look at the gains and at the contributions we are making. It is helpful to men, too, to see the increasingly important positions in society which women are successfully filling. It increases their confidence in us, and it opens new opportunities to us.

At the same time, taking a good look at what we have done often serves the equally useful purpose of exposing those areas where we are not doing too terribly well, or where a great deal more remains to be done. I would urge all of you to take a little time out once in a while to reflect seriously on what we have accomplished—and what we have still failed to do. . . . Whenever I think of the strides we have made, I am reminded of a remark which Susan Anthony made almost 100 years ago. "Modern invention," she said, "has banished the spinning wheel, and the same law of progress makes

the woman of today a different woman from her grandmother."

Wrapped up in these words of Susan Anthony, and in this fast-growing realization of the potential importance of women is perhaps the greatest of all challenges to us—the challenge of where, and how, we can find our proper place in such a swiftly changing world. . . .

I am inclined to think that in Red China and the Soviet Union the role of women has changed too radically. As someone said not long ago, "Russia has the epitome of equal rights, and women are freely offered equality—in all the hard and unyielding tasks like digging sewers, laying cobblestones and stoking blast furnaces."

But this does not deny the fact that in some areas they are doing wonderfully well—and we are not. Over 70 percent of the doctors in Russia are women, and half of the science students in their universities are women. The percentages in our country are a little pale by comparison. Only 5½ percent of our medical students are women, less than 1 percent of our engineering students are girls, and only 4 percent are studying chemistry and physics. Yet experts unanimously agree that women have as much capacity in all of these fields as men. We are simply not making full use of the great potential that is ours until we move into these areas of endeavor and begin making the contributions of which we are fully capable.

Today, as never before in our history, we are locked in a struggle with an opposing ideology which is using every means at its disposal to overwhelm our way of life. We must answer this challenge in kind, with our total effort of our own. . . .

There is still much to be done if we are to fulfill the role that should be ours in this wonderfully exciting period of history. It will require work and sacrifice, and more work, and it will not be easy. But our battles have never been easy, and as I look into the future, with all its uncertainties, I cannot help but look back over my shoulder occasionally into the past, and what I see there is always heartening.

A hundred years ago, women had no right to higher education, no right to enter the trades and professions, no right to own their own property, no right to vote or hold office. And then a small band of courageous, farsighted women rose up to fight for those things in which they believed. Their names? Carrie Chapman Catt, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony—none of them will be forgotten. And as I look ahead today I can foresee other women by the scores, equally courageous, equally farsighted, taking their places, even as women today are taking their places, and I am confident that, as we have never failed before, we will not fail now.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Nation celebrated the 139th anniversary of the birth of one of our greatest women, Susan B. Anthony.

Since her birth, the status of women in American life, and especially in the political life of the Nation, has been revolutionized. No man or woman in the land played a more vital role in bringing about that revolutionary change than did Susan B. Anthony.

Those of us from western Massachusetts, where in the little town of Adams Susan B. Anthony was born on February 15, 1820, are proud of this native daughter.

As a member of the Massachusetts State Senate, I was pleased to introduce a resolution making August 26, the day that the equal suffrage amendment to the Constitution became law, Susan B.

Anthony Day in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

I am indeed thrilled to see here today the tributes being given to our native daughter by Members of the Congress from all parts of the Nation.

We in Massachusetts cannot be selfish about Susan B. Anthony, simply because she was born in our State. Her life was dedicated to the cause of equal suffrage for women throughout America. Her life work has borne fruits in every corner of the globe. For these reasons we are glad to share her memory with all the world.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this past week, we in the U.S. Congress have been celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, the emancipator of an entire race. It is fitting that we now pay our tribute in the same way to one who was an emancipator of American women—Susan B. Anthony.

Her birthday is being celebrated February 16 in all parts of the country. Her statue is here in the crypt of our Capitol Building, a gift from American women. The 19th amendment to the Constitution, which enfranchised women, is popular known as the Susan B. Anthony amendment. Every year comes new recognition of what she did to elevate the position of the women in our country.

Suffrage for women is, of course, taken for granted to day—and this is well, for we do not like to recall that our mothers, wives and daughters did not always share with us, their husbands and fathers and sons and brothers, the primary right—and duty—of the franchise. Fortunately man's memory is so constituted that we do take for granted what is obviously right and good.

But the ideal for which Susan B. Anthony and her valiant fellow workers had to struggle so long and so mightily—yes, and to endure sacrifices and ridicule and indignity—is not yet realized. We here have the power to complete the task and to erase the blot which makes half our Nation not equal under the law. Let us complete the task now, and within a short time—I feel confident—it will be taken for granted that in the United States all citizens are equal under the law.

On the anniversary of the birth of Susan B. Anthony 200 Members of the House of Representatives announced publicly their intention to carry to a conclusion, as far as Congress can do so, the work to which Susan B. Anthony devoted her life efforts by giving their support to the equal rights for women amendment introduced by the Honorable KATHARINE ST. GEORGE and 38 other Members. There is no better way in which to bring our tribute to Susan B. Anthony.

RE-REFERENCE OF H.R. 1341

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H.R. 1341, which was previously referred to the Committee on Government Operations, be re-referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to provide a termination date of the excise tax on telephone service.

This bill is identical to the bill introduced by the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, whose permission I have to join him in sponsoring the termination of this unfair tax.

Last year I introduced a bill to do away with the telephone tax altogether, but the bill was not considered and will not be considered this year because of the need for revenue. Instead of trying to terminate it this year we are trying to propose a termination date of June 30, 1960, in order to search for other sources of revenue to replace the revenue unfairly collected from telephone users. I say "unfairly" because of matters hereinafter outlined.

During World War II this telephone tax was imposed on the Nation's telephone users. It was designed to reduce the traffic load on telephone plants overburdened by wartime calls, and to discourage new service that would necessitate installing critical new equipment. It was supposed to be a temporary tax.

World War II has been over for nearly 14 years. New equipment and services have been available for much of that time. But the tax still stands, a monument to emergency, and a millstone around the collective necks of telephone users which includes practically everybody.

To the customer, the tax represents a 10 percent higher monthly telephone bill.

To the Government the tax represents another convenient access to the public pocketbook, disguised as higher telephone rates; a mask that most customers do not recognize even though it is itemized on their bills.

To the company, the tax represents money it must collect at its own expense for the Federal Government.

The tax is unfair to every user of the telephone. It is discriminatory. There is no such tax on any of the other public utilities—electric, gas, or water. It puts an essential public service in the same class as jewelry, perfume, and entertainment.

An effort has been made to obtain repeal of the tax for years. Many bills have been introduced in Congress. Failing to keep faith with the public, the Federal Government is going to consider offering as much as 40 percent of the telephone tax revenue to the States for financing vocational schools and sewage treatment.

If Congress passes this measure, and if it should be accepted by the State legislatures, the discriminatory tele-

phone tax likely will be with us forever, past all hope of repeal.

Once a new tax is instituted, history shows that it dies hard, because the money has become a permanent part of the budget, even though the original need for it has passed.

Certainly there are better ways for defraying the cost of vocational schools and sewage treatment than by imposing part of the burden on a particular part of the tax-paying public—the telephone users.

The entire communications industry has urged the elimination of these taxes at every opportunity. Representatives of the United States Independent Telephone Association and of the Bell System have testified before congressional committees. Industry witnesses have taken the position that while the Government need for revenue must be recognized, this discriminatory tax imposed to meet a national emergency, should be eliminated just as soon as Government revenue requirements permit. At the same time, the question remains whether a tax so discriminatory as the telephone excise tax should be continued in lieu of obtaining needed revenue from other tax sources.

Congress having repealed the excise tax on the transportation of goods in 1953, communications and the transportation of persons—where the cost of the fare is 60 cents or more—remain the only services now subject to excise taxes. There is danger that these remaining taxes will become permanent unless Congress acts to prevent it.

The Joint Federal-State Action Committee proposal that 40 percent of the local telephone tax be turned over to the States emphasizes the danger of the tax becoming permanent. The proposal overlooks, first, that the local telephone tax was a wartime emergency tax; second, that no excise tax was ever imposed upon local telephone service until required by World War II; and third, that this would in effect saddle upon the telephone user the costs of vocational training and new waste disposal plants in all States—costs that should be borne by all taxpayers just as other expenses of Government are.

Telephone customers carry a big telephone taxload even without the excise tax. For instance, in 1957 the Bell System alone paid \$1.3 billion in operating taxes and collected directly from telephone users about \$515 million more in excise taxes on the services they used. This totals more than \$51 per customer per year. Without the excise tax, telephone users would seem to be carrying their full share of the tax burden.

If this iniquitous levy were eliminated, the telephone user would get the full benefit because the telephone company acts merely as a collection agent for the Federal Government—at the customer's expense. If the tax were eliminated the customer would ultimately benefit in another way, namely, from the saving on collection expense which must necessarily become a part of the cost of service.

For these reasons it is natural that telephone companies object to these Federal excise taxes. They do so for

three good reasons: First, a company has a responsibility to object to unequal and discriminating taxes levied on its customers; second, excise taxes increase materially the cost of telephone service to customers, and may well curtail their use of telephone service which automatically reduces the value of telephone service to existing customers; third, administering the collection of excise taxes adds an additional amount to the cost of telephone service.

Telephone users are unhappy about having to pay excise taxes on their service. Testimony indicating just how unhappy telephone users are about this tax has been offered before the House Ways and Means Committee by representatives of such organizations as the American Hotel Association, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, New York Stock Exchange, American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, the United States Independent Telephone Association, and the Bell System.

The State and Federal regulatory agencies strenuously oppose excise taxes on communication services for a variety of reasons, the chief one being that the tax makes it difficult to set fair rates for services. At its 1958 convention, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners unanimously petitioned the Congress to terminate the discriminatory excise taxes on communications and transportation services at the earliest possible date.

To sum up, there are three basic reasons why excises on communications services should be repealed:

First. The longer they are continued the greater the danger that they will become a permanent part of the tax structure, which was never intended by the Congress that put them in effect.

Second. They are unfair and discriminatory against telephone users as a group. Telephone service is regarded as a daily necessity. Yet Congress treats it as a luxury by subjecting it to the same taxes that are imposed on unnecessary luxuries such as club dues, night club bills, liquor and tobacco. It is the only household utility service so taxed.

Third. The necessity for maintaining Federal tax revenues at the current high levels should not preclude the elimination of these taxes on communications services, so vital and essential in the everyday life of most Americans.

The nature of the tax demands its early repeal or at least the immediate adoption of a firm termination date.

I quote an article from the Telephone News issue of December 1958, which I think is significant:

FIFTEEN-DOLLAR FEDERAL LICENSE FEE FOR TELEPHONE USERS?—OUR CUSTOMERS ARE ALREADY PAYING IT

Suppose the Federal Government passed a law making every telephone customer pay \$15 a year for a license to use his telephone.

Farfetched? Not at all. Telephone subscribers across the Nation already pay this average sum each year for the privilege of making local and long-distance calls.

Of course, telephone users do not receive licenses for their money. The fee is paid in

excise taxes—10 percent of the amounts paid for all local and long-distance service. Business houses, manufacturers and other large telephone users pay thousands of dollars in excise taxes annually.

Our companies collect the money and pass it along to the Federal Government. None of it ever comes back as direct benefits to our companies or our customers.

The excise tax on telephone service was inaugurated as a temporary, emergency measure. During World War II it served two purposes: to raise revenue and to discourage the use of service which could not be expanded to meet civilian demand.

The war emergency has passed. The civilian demand has long since ceased to interfere with military needs. The temporary excise tax remains.

The tax is unfair, discriminatory and unrealistic. It penalizes one segment of the public; it singles out the telephone from other household utilities—gas, water and electricity—which have no such tax; and it is imposed much in the same way as the tax on luxuries—liquor, jewelry, furs and night clubs.

The tax is an unwarranted burden on our subscribers, and regardless of whether it costs a customer thousands of dollars, \$15 or even \$1, we believe it is unfair and we oppose it.

And now comes a new and more harmful proposal. The Joint Federal-State Action Committee proposes that part of this tax burdening the telephone user—40 percent of the amount levied on local telephone service—be handed over to the States. The States, thus subsidized by the telephone user, would be required to devote these funds to the erection of sewage disposal plants and for vocational training. The balance of the excise taxes on telephone service would still remain in the Federal tax structure.

This proposal would in effect make this unfair, discriminatory tax a permanent part of the States' tax laws. In such circumstances the possibility of repealing any part of the telephone excise tax would seem remote.

Our customers justly resent this unfair tax on their telephone service and should have the facts to carry their case effectively to the State and national lawmakers. And each of us owes it to our customers, neighbors and friends to give them these facts that are so vital to their pocketbooks.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge too strongly the early consideration of this legislation, the enactment of which is long overdue.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority has recently announced its approval of the purchase of the Nation's biggest steam turbine generator from an English manufacturer. This is not an ordinary, everyday decision by our Government. It is a precedent-setting and, I believe, shortsighted and dangerous action.

For some years our Government has been buying an increasing amount of electrical equipment abroad—simply because the very low wages of foreign workmen makes possible much lower prices on this custom-built heavy electrical apparatus. But never before had our Government purchased a steam tur-

bine generator—the key unit of an electric power system—from abroad. Now, for the first time, the U.S. Government has taken this step, and in so doing, has bought the Nation's biggest steam turbine generator in history.

Why do I say this is dangerous policy? Because this is just one more step—and the biggest step yet—toward making this Nation's vital electric power system dependent upon a foreign country for maintenance and repair.

Power generators are not quickly replaceable or repairable. They are giant machines bigger than a house and extremely complicated in their design and manufacture. They are not alike, in that each one is specially built to meet the specific needs of its user. Their maintenance, in peace or war, requires ready access to the manufacturing plant of the builder and technical consultation service of his engineers without dependence on ocean transportation. To buy key machines of this type for vital national defense power needs—as in the TVA area—is to utterly disregard the hazards involved. It is most significant that the English, with a government-owned electric power system, do not buy such power generators from foreign firms as a matter of policy, for this very reason of their national security. Yet there are many in this country who weep for the British if anyone suggests that the United States should show equal intelligence.

Why do I say that this action is not only dangerous, but also shortsighted? I refer to the effect on our own economy. This single order for a 500,000-kilowatt steam turbine generator represents 1,080,000 man-hours of work which will be lost to the employees of the low U.S. bidder. The low U.S. bidder in this case, after TVA evaluated the base bids, was the Westinghouse Electric Corp. I note that the General Electric Co. claims to be the low American bidder, but the Washington office of TVA states that when the bids were evaluated by TVA in terms of the specifications, Westinghouse Electric was lower than General Electric. This means that if there had been no lower foreign bid, Westinghouse would have been awarded this contract. The lost order represents, in addition, 375,000 man-hours of work lost to hundreds of Westinghouse suppliers. All of this is enough work for 700 people for a full year. And this is a time when employment is seriously curtailed in the American plants which make heavy electrical apparatus, such as those of Westinghouse in Lester, Delaware County, Pa., and in East Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I want to note at this point that I agree with everything the gentleman has said so far and probably will with everything else he says. I am glad he is joining in this fight, because not alone are we buying from England, but just as late as last week we purchased or gave a letter of intent to

purchase steam generators from a Swiss company known as Brown-Boveri, which will replace work intended for the Elliott Corp. in Jeannette, Pa., a plant now operating at 40 percent of capacity. All of this, I might say, is the direct result of the President's Executive order in 1954 which wiped out the 25 percent differential previously allowed under our trade agreements with European competitors for public business, and he reduced it to 6 percent, which does not even cover the cost of Government mandated additions, such as the Workmen's Compensation Act, the Social Security Act, as well as the other mandated costs that we, as a government have placed against the American producers. I join the gentleman in the fight he is making.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

These are labor depressed areas. Many of the workmen affected by this loss of work have as much as 17 years seniority on their jobs.

Is this situation the fault of the Westinghouse Co. or of the 700 employees who may be thrown out of work? Indeed it is not. The difference in bid prices between Westinghouse Co. and the C. A. Parsons Co. of England is the direct result of the wide wage differentials which exist between England and the United States and which our laws help maintain. The average English wage rates are only 37 percent of U.S. wage rates. American manufacturers cannot possibly compete on heavy, custom-built electrical apparatus with its high labor content, against English prices. They cannot compete, that is, unless our Government gets smart enough to consider not just price, but also the other vitally important considerations on which there is no price. I mean the jobs of American workmen and the security of the Nation itself.

This is neither the time nor the place for bargain-basement buying or price-tag politics. But for the benefit of those who are genuinely concerned about the rising cost of government, as am I, let me point out that the lower foreign price in this case should be viewed in light of what this country will lose in tax revenues by placing this order abroad. It will cost the United States about \$3,600,000 in lost tax revenues to both the Federal and the State governments. This loss will eat up most of the so-called saving to the Government through the lower foreign price which is made possible by cheap labor.

Mr. Speaker, if one were to disregard all I have said up to this point, there is another most important consideration weighing heavily in favor of buying such power generators as those from domestic manufacturers. That is simply the many advantages to TVA or whatever other Government agency may be the purchaser. In this important matter of maintenance, for example, the Westinghouse Co. has a technical organization for service and repair which includes more than 1,000 field service engineers. In contrast, Parsons has three technical men in Canada and is dependent on service and parts from England—service

and parts that could be cut off entirely in case of war.

In the matter of the technical differences between the products of the two firms, Westinghouse has built turbine generators which operate at higher temperatures and pressures than do the Parsons generators. For example, Westinghouse is now building a 325,000-kilowatt machine to operate at 3,600 revolutions per minute, while Parsons' largest machine is a 120,000 kilowatt generator operating at 3,000 r.p.m. Also, the Westinghouse bid in this instance guaranteed 13,000 kilowatts over the Parsons bid guarantee. One must seriously question, therefore, whether foreign manufacturers are as well qualified to design and build a giant half-million kilowatt generator as are American firms which have led the world in such research, development, and construction and who back up their work with firm performance guarantees.

All of this casts even greater importance on a petition now awaiting decision by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. This petition, supported by the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, asks that four major elements of electric power systems be listed as defense essential, and that import of these specific products be restricted in the national interest. This would not apply to most of the electrical industry's products—just four in the heavy power apparatus category.

Since other nations which are capable of manufacturing their own heavy power equipment consider it unwise to use foreign-made machines of this type in their power systems, our own Government should have no hesitancy in following a similar course. Common sense dictates such action. To follow an opposite policy in the name of better international relations is to badly confuse the issue and to appear naive in the eyes of our more realistic friends abroad.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I desire to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks, and very emphatically, representing a district in which the turbine manufacturing facilities of the General Electric Co. are located. While we may differ, and there seems to be some question of difference as to who was the lowest domestic bidder in connection with the TVA contract, I think we certainly agree on the point the gentleman has made.

I should like to urge the gentleman to associate himself with a request I have directed to Governor Hoegh of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization requesting him to examine this contract and determine whether for reasons of national security he has the right to recommend that it be disallowed. It is my understanding that that question is currently under consideration by the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization. I would hope that the gentleman and his associates on his side of the aisle might use their influence at the other end of the Avenue so that we could establish

the principle of domestic purchases for facilities on this important national security project.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I thank the gentleman. I certainly agree that these heavy electric giant hearts of powerplants should be bought in America.

SAM RAYBURN AND JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., RECEIVE TWIN SILVER QUILL AWARDS OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D.C., on January 23, the Senate majority leader, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, presented twin 1958 Silver Quill Awards of National Business Publications—highest tribute of the business press—to the Speaker of the House, SAM RAYBURN, and its former Speaker, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., for "distinguished legislative service to business and industry."

This annual Washington dinner features a question-and-answer period in which captains of industry, Cabinet officers, and other Government leaders gage the state of the Nation by discussing the prospects in their respective areas of the economy.

National Business Publications is an association of publishers of 203 technical, professional, industrial, scientific, merchandising, and marketing magazines.

Business Publications perform a unique service to the economy. They facilitate the exchange of business education and industrial know-how. They stimulate our enterprise. They power the progress of our technology.

Business magazines are designed to serve the needs of the specialist who must keep abreast of newest developments in his highly specialized field.

The history of business publishing parallels the growth of business and industry in America.

The excerpts follow:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES RICHARD P. SMITH, PRESIDENT, W. R. C. SMITH PUBLISHING CO., AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

It is always our hope that this state of the Nation dinner will prove to be a harbinger of better times to come. Here—at our head tables—are leaders from government and industry who have graciously consented to answer one specific question related to our dinner theme, "A Platform for Business in a Space-Age Economy." All have agreed to operate under a tight 2-minute rule.

We are also privileged tonight by the presence at our podium of a famous news analyst, commentator, and correspondent. He has courteously consented to be our moderator and will ask the questions which are to be answered. It is my good fortune to be the one to present to you Mr. Walter Cronkite.

"REMARKS BY WALTER CRONKITE, NEWS COMMENTATOR, COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM"

"Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Mister Sam, Senator JOHNSON, Speaker JOE—and other members of this very distinguished company—I am highly honored to be a part

of this truly significant occasion. I want to thank an old friend, your president, Bob Harper, for making it possible. Answers to our questions follow in the order listed in your program. I will initiate each question by simply announcing the name of the speaker. So, now, on the beam of our theme, "A Platform for Business in a Space-Age Economy," we begin with Mr. Rogers:

"State of Nation questions and answers"

"William P. Rogers, the Attorney General

"Question. Mr. Attorney General, in considering the possibility of future political action by the business community, now that organized labor has become such a major factor in politics, wouldn't it be more equitable to amend the Corrupt Practices Act, so that the American investor could become more active in political campaigns through those organizations in which he is a stockholder?

"Answer. Walter, I'm not sure why you ask me this question. Due to certain unfortunate developments last fall, we Republicans don't have much to say about changing the laws.

"The suggestion, in the question, that the business community should take a more active part in political affairs to offset union activities, I think, is the wrong emphasis. I firmly believe that the business community should take a more active part in political affairs, but for an entirely different reason. No group in this country has a greater stake in the future of our country than the business community, and, by taking a more active part, they can contribute very significantly to the future of our country. So, I am thoroughly in accord with more activity on the part of the business community.

"Now, specifically addressing myself to the question, let me say that the Corrupt Practices Act is misunderstood by a lot of people. I doubt if many people have actually read it. There probably are not as many changes, as you might think, that can be made in the law, on a superficial reading of it. But, in order to avoid the suggestion that might come to your mind that I don't think there are things that can be done to improve the law, I want to say right away that that is not the case and there may be some ways that the law can be strengthened.

"To be sure that you direct your interest and energy in the right direction I, in closing, would like to suggest that, if you do have a feeling that there are specific changes that should be made in the law, you send your letters to LYNDON JOHNSON. Thank you.

"Herman K. Intemann, President Union Carbide Metals Co.

"Question. Mr. Intemann, in the all-out race to conquer outer space, are you satisfied that we are blessed with sufficient resources—in the way of essential fuels, minerals and metals—to assure future successful competition by our related industries with those formidable space-age developments already being forecast by other major world-power nations?

"Answer. The natural resources of this Nation have long supplied an economy that has produced the highest living standard in the world and has accomplished the greatest technological progress man has ever seen. These resources, with respect to fuels, minerals, and metals, are ample to take care of outer space needs in the foreseeable future. We're not yet talking about a space rocket in every garage or an automobile type of mass production operation that consumes vast amounts of materials. The real problem is not one of sufficient quantity of natural resources, but the conversion of these resources to chemical and metallurgical materials which give optimum performance under the unusual conditions that exist in space. Research in industry, government and the academic world has virtually ac-

complished miracles in the past and can be counted on to meet successfully this challenge.

"Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture

"Question. Mr. Secretary Benson, it is obvious, of course, that—if we are to reap the harvest of outer space supremacy—we must sow the fields of our enterprise with ever-increasing expenditures for the required equipment and allied developments. Without impairing our vital food and fiber supply—how much money can we safely cut from our regular appropriations for carrying on the business of agriculture?

"Answer. The answer to your question is twofold. First, the amount requested for agriculture in the President's budget is a minimum needed under present laws to carry out the required functions of this Department. The President is striving for a balanced budget in 1960 and the Department of Agriculture's budget reflects a sincere effort to do our part.

"Secondly, under the terms of existing legislation (which is outmoded and unrealistic in this day of tremendous agricultural efficiency and production), we are required to provide price supports to farmers on a few crops, 12 out of 250. With mandatory supports at high, unrealistic levels and with crop production setting new records, these outlays have become tremendous. If Congress will take a hard, realistic look at the price-support programs and act at once, we can substantially reduce these costs. This will not impair our vital food and fiber supply and will improve the economic health not only of our farmers and ranchers but of our whole Nation.

"Under these old depression-war-born laws, surplus is built up. Markets have been lost. Controls have failed and costs to taxpayers have risen. Farmers need and want freedom to plant, freedom to market, freedom to compete, and freedom from Government regulation and control.

"John R. Kimberly, Chairman and President, Kimberly-Clark Corp.

"Question. Mr. Kimberly, handicapped as we now seem to be—with spiraling wages, prices, and taxes already pricing us out of world markets, all the way from Scandinavia to Latin America—are you inclined to agree with the prediction that unless we find a way to stabilize production and distribution costs, we can easily become a nation forced to ration even such desirable daily customs as coffee-drinking?

"Answer. Yes; I do agree that we must find a way to stabilize costs if we are to maintain our leadership in economic development. This is vital not only to maintain and expand our world markets but to keep our domestic economy in a strong, competitive position and avoid further inflation.

"Under our present program of gradual tariff reductions and the development of common markets abroad, industry in this country must find new ways of increasing its efficiency and real productivity. Our goods and services must be leaders in quality and have a value in the market that not only maintains existing customers but develops new ones.

"The alternative would be to drop our standard of living to equal that of our competitors. This can be avoided, if we are willing to face up to the fact that industry can finance future development in terms of research for new products and capital expenditures for their production only out of earnings.

"If the tax burden on business could be brought down and an opportunity provided for increased incentive in the form of earnings, I believe we can hold down inflation and, at the same time, improve real wages and, through increases in volume, maintain government revenues.

"We must seek out and welcome innovation in our approach to our economic development. This is the responsibility of all of us in industry and in government.

"Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army

"Question. Mr. Secretary Brucker, it has always been said that a good offense is the best defense. Why, then, should we expend so much money and effort on defensive weapons and equipment? Wouldn't it be better to concentrate our resources on the development of offensive power?

"Answer. Mr. Cronkite and good friends. This matter of discussing offense and defense and all of the military, in 2 minutes, is about like asking Einstein to talk about relativity and the theory of it. I want to assure you tonight that there's no truth to the rumor that the Navy and the Air Force have donated their time to the Secretary of the Army for this purpose. You may think that this has been a great night, tonight, but I've spent 2 days, yesterday and today, before the Senate Armed Services Committee defending the Army's budget. So, I'm qualified to speak about defense tonight.

"Now, to get into this job. The word is balance—forces must never get out of balance. It's just like a football team. If you've got a good backfield with a weak line, you'll never get anywhere or, vice versa, if you've got a weak backfield and a strong line, you'll always lose. We've got to pay attention to both the backfield and the line—it's a question of sheer balance in the spending for national defense. Now, this goes the whole gamut. There's never been a weapon, since the time of the bow and arrow and the spear down to the missile and the intercontinental ballistic missile and the anti-missile missile, never a one, that couldn't be countered and defended against with something else. It's always a contest—manpower against weapons, submarines against torpedoes, divisions against artillery, anti-missiles against missiles, airplanes against antiaircraft artillery or surface-to-air missiles and so forth. It's a question simply of proper balance.

"In this country, at the present time, we're open to attack. Not because we want to be but because in conscience and good principle this country can never strike a first blow. In that situation the whole thing becomes topsy-turvy. Instead of talking about offense, we have to start with a strong defense, in order to make possible the raising of SAC from the ground and getting the rest of our offense on the move. So, in talking about either offense or defense, you switch sides very, very rapidly. But, again when we talk about defense and offense, we must remember that we have, in this world, 43 allies with whom we are very closely related. They're all around the world. They extend from Europe to the Far East and to the reaches of Australia—and they're our friends. They're our best help overseas. Our divisions, our planes, and our ships are, of course, of assistance to them out there, and they to us. So, they become not only a defensive weapon at home but an offensive weapon, as an ally, to us here.

"In this great moving spectacle of defense this country must, tonight, visualize the coming of whatever may happen. A strong defense and a strong offense are like the prizefighter in the ring. The fellow who sticks his chin out but has no defense had better watch out, even though he's got a wallop in both the right and left. Tonight balance is the word our country needs—balance in defense, manpower, weapons, planes, ships, and guns.

"Edmond H. Leavey, President, International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

"Question. Mr. Leavey, we are told that astronomical communications are already a problem of major magnitude, due to congestion of the radio spectrum and a lack of

regulations for space-age situations. Will you give us a few hints of things to come in space communications and possible future commercial application of these developments?

"Answer. Major problems of space communications are not attributable to spectrum congestion and lack of regulations alone. Other difficulties are posed by the extreme distances involved, power limitations, characteristics of the earth's atmosphere and space, and the present limited payloads of space vehicles.

"Nevertheless, we believe that worldwide communications employing space satellites can certainly be a reality, although it will take a major effort. Many years of operational experience with satellite links will be required before complete global communications by this means will be perfected.

"In the industry for which I am speaking, many plans are being suggested. For example, ITT laboratories for some time has been studying a global system using stationary satellites. It would work this way: Three satellites would be put into equatorial orbit at approximately 24,000 miles from the earth, circling it every 24 hours, so that the positions of the satellites relative to the earth would remain fixed.

"By placing the satellites at equal distance about the orbit and equipping each with a microwave receiver and transmitter, line-of-sight microwave communications would be possible throughout the world except for minor polar areas.

"Direct dial telephoning around the world would then be possible. Television programs could be beamed to the world. Communications facilities would thus be available via the satellites.

"The problem of congestion in the radio spectrum which was raised in your question, is under study by experts in this field and the outlook for a solution is most encouraging. Final allocation of frequencies will be determined, of course, by international agreements.

"We believe a global satellite communications system is within reach and that it can be a powerful weapon for peace.

"James H. Douglas, Secretary of the Air Force

"Question. Mr. Secretary Douglas, some experts maintain that missiles have already caused the obsolescence of man-piloted aircraft as a weapon of future warfare. If that contention is correct, would it not result in much less cost to the American taxpayer, if we could either have only one military service or let qualified civilian personnel run the missile program?

"Answer. First, I must disagree with the experts if they think that manned aircraft will not play an important part in future warfare. I believe that for years to come there will be a firm requirement for long-range bombers, for long-range piloted interceptors and for tactical fighter aircraft. Missiles will replace substantial numbers of our aircraft, but missiles and manned aircraft will supplement each other. The manned bomber will receive great assistance from the long-range ballistic missile in its task of penetrating enemy defenses. It is also becoming a platform for missiles. What we are seeking is the most effective mix of missiles and manned aircraft.

"I disagree with the suggestion that manned aircraft are obsolescent, but this position should not dismiss the question. Can we get adequate defense for less cost, whether by one military service or by having civilian personnel run the missile program? In my opinion, the defense enterprise is too big for one military service and the defense reorganization makes clear the authority of the Secretary of Defense to avoid wasteful duplication in missile and other weapon systems programs. As to

civilian personnel, I would say the missile programs are under teams that represent military-civilian partnerships. The Air Force ballistic missile program, which I believe has been outstandingly successful, is a good example. There the Ballistic Missile Division, under General Schriever, depends upon more than 500 civilian scientists and technicians for systems engineering and technical direction of our ballistic missile programs.

"To the extent that the question suggests the need to press ahead as advancing technology permits and keep our forces modern, let me assure you this is the purpose of the Air Force. To maintain the military strength that is our best assurance of peace, we are aggressively developing the weapons of tomorrow and bringing them into our inventory to replace weapons of the past at the earliest time consistent with maintaining ready reliable forces.

"H. M. Horner, Chairman, United Aircraft Corp.

"Question. Mr. Horner, are you convinced that American industry can assume the job—with qualified personnel, modern laboratories and factories, and sufficient tools—to research, manufacture and maintain all necessary space-age "hardware" and supporting facilities, at a lower cost to the taxpayer than it can be done if researched and produced exclusively by the Government in facilities completely owned by the Government?

"Answer. Yes, with these explanations. In a field as dynamic as flight—whether it is in the earth's own atmosphere or in space itself—there will be the constant need for complex research, development and production facilities. There will always be the need for personnel that is steadily abreast of the expanding arts and sciences, trained to increase their dimensions. So, up-to-date facilities and technically skilled manpower will be an unceasing requirement, no matter who undertakes the job. This has been so in aviation since Kitty Hawk and it will continue to be, so long as we seek to improve the dimensions of flight.

"Some Government support for facilities traditionally has supplemented the engineering and production facilities of industry for such complex and costly vehicles as advanced fighters, bombers, missiles, and rockets. The very nature of their conception and realization, together with many other factors, has required such assistance. A better technical and less expensive job can be done, however, for the whole range of space flight, if the assignment is placed with industry. It can be done far more rapidly, too—and time, in my opinion, is the most important qualification of all. Among many reasons I could advance to support my position for industry, perhaps the most prosaic is the most telling. This country has always operated with pretty good success by using the competitive system. We know that system, so why should we throw it over for a way of operation that has proven inferior and in which our chief competitor has a 40-year start?

"If American industry is given the job in the proper climate, we can lead the world in the space age. American industry proved its ability to perform these complex technological tasks by giving this country the finest overall Air Force the world has ever known during World War II. It is the competitive drive of our system of private industry that is all important. Moreover, if all research, development and production are lodged in the Government itself, then the customer is also the developer and producer. Would this customer, who is also the developer, readily admit that a good job was not being done? Most Americans, I think, would have a two-word description for the condition—not good.

"Lewis L. Strauss, Secretary of Commerce

"Question. Mr. Secretary Strauss, as head of the businessman's department of Government, do you consider it probable that the very nature of our future economy could adversely affect private enterprise—by prompting more and more participation by Federal agencies in the actual business of producing and providing many of the items required for space age progress?

"Answer. I would expect the reverse. I believe private competitive enterprise will play an increasingly greater role. We will not make what you have called space-age progress by resorting to State-dominated collectivism. The Government can only enter the business of production in competition with its citizens at the expense of progress.

"We are on the threshold of a new decade during which our population should grow from 180 million next year to 214 million in 1970. Invention and innovation will supply increasing needs and provide new products for our more numerous, continuously better educated and more prosperous consuming public. Only the forward thrust of a free economic system can develop velocity for the anticipated record-breaking prosperity and for our national security.

"Even the massive research and giant production, required by government for nuclear space-age progress, stem in greatest measure from individual ingenuity and from contracting with private business.

"If the American goals continue to be both scientific preeminence and individual liberty, our perfected instrument for their attainment will be free enterprise, encouraged by a sagacious government but operated by resourceful private citizens in the common interest of everyone.

"A. King McCord, President, Westinghouse Air Brake Co.

"Question. Mr. McCord, do you believe that our national security can be served better by additional foreign aid in the way of investment overseas by American private capital—to further the free-enterprise system abroad—or by private domestic educational programs designed to achieve greater public recognition of the benefits and efficiencies of the American free enterprise system?

"Answer. My belief is that our national security can be served better by private domestic educational programs of the type described by the question, rather than by additional overseas investment by private American capital.

"This position is taken with full recognition that investment of American private capital abroad is important to our mutual security program and, as such, contributes to the strengthening of national security.

"However, the question requires that I select one of two alternatives or, at the least, express an opinion as to a priority of action.

"National security, I believe, rests upon the foundation of an efficient and expanding free-enterprise system at home. To maintain our system and permit it to reach its greatest potential requires continuing and aggressive public support. Such support, from an informed public, will result in more efficient individual effort and be reflected in a political climate which continues to support the free-enterprise system and encourage the expansion of our economy.

"As the free-enterprise system continues to succeed here, in that degree, it should and will compel imitation abroad. If it fails here or does not continue as the system of greatest economic promise, then no amount of investment abroad or foreign aid will persuade recipient peoples to follow our example.

"Obliged to choose between the two alternatives, I am compelled to favor education at home over investment abroad because ac-

ceptance of our free-enterprise system abroad depends upon its success at home.

"Arthur E. Summerfield, the Postmaster General

"Question. Mr. Postmaster General, with all of the planning and projecting of missile missions to the moon and back and elsewhere in outer space—as part of your modernization program—are you contemplating delivery of mail to foreign countries and to space stations throughout the universe via red, white, and blue rockets?

"Answer. Walter, if I did not know you better I could suggest you had your tongue in your cheek when you asked me that question.

"Seriously, however, your question reminds me of a famous prediction which was made nearly a hundred years before the Wright brothers flew the first airplane at Kitty Hawk.

"In his immortal poem, "Locksley Hall," Alfred Lord Tennyson made this observation:

"For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be:

"Saw the heavens fill with commerce,
argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales."

"Not many of us have the eloquence or great vision of Alfred Lord Tennyson, but this I can say—we stand today on the threshold of the greatest peaceful use of missile development, the transmission of mail between the peoples of the world by guided missile.

"Let me assure you, Walter, that the peaceful use of guided missiles for transmission of mail is presently under serious study by the Post Office Department.

"The postal service will continue to keep pace with the great scientific achievements which are being made. Wherever our citizens may go in this great universe, the delivery of their mail will continue to be expedited whether they are on the moon or on a space station, or in the far corners of the earth.

"In my judgment, before man reaches the moon, your mail will be delivered within hours from New York to California, to England, to India, or to Australia by guided missiles.

"And if Congress provides us with sufficient funds, you may be assured that mail-carrying rocket missiles will be painted with the traditional colors—red, white, and blue—of which every American is justly proud.

"Harlee Branch, Jr., President, the Southern Co.

"Question. Mr. Branch, by constantly increasing the availability of loans to foreign countries for developmental projects, at the current annual rate of some \$700 million, isn't it conceivable that we are really only creating a Frankenstein in the market by way of self-financed competition for our own manufacturers?

"Answer. I think the word "Frankenstein" is too strong. It suggests an uncontrollable monster which turns on and destroys its creator. I do not think that loans to foreign countries for developmental projects, if prudently and realistically granted, are uncontrollable competition for American manufacturers.

"Certainly, these loan programs must be realistically geared, not only to the economic needs and desires of the borrowers, but also to the ability of our people to provide the loans without seriously impairing our own economic strength and stability. There is a limit in this respect which cannot be ignored.

"Assuming that our foreign loan programs are skillfully managed, then we must be concerned with other governmental pro-

grams which tend to hobble the competitive capacity of American industry. My primary concern is—I think—with a tax-depreciation program which discourages the prompt replacement of obsolete industrial equipment with the most modern and efficient apparatus which our scientific and engineering skills can make available.

"I am also concerned with labor and tariff policies which impair the ability of American manufacturers to compete on even terms with foreign manufacturers—even in American markets. And, of course, I am concerned—as every American should be—with the specter of inflation and with any governmental policy—whether related to foreign loans or domestic spending—which tends to fuel the inflationary spiral.

"What I am trying to say is this—a foreign loan program, if realistically and prudently managed, is not likely, of itself, to create a "Frankenstein" for our people. But, such a program, if conducted in an irresponsible fashion and if coupled with other reckless and profligate domestic programs, could produce such a result. All of these things are, in my opinion, controllable. The question is whether the American people and their elected leaders have the will and wisdom to exercise the realistic control.

"Wm. McC. Martin, Jr., Chairman, Federal Reserve System

"Question. Mr. Chairman, due no doubt to our loss last year of over \$2 billion in gold, plus continued deficit spending to the tune of \$12 billion—we hear disturbing reports about a growing distrust around the world for future stability of the American dollar. Can we continue on our current financial course, without losing face both as a fiscal and as a moral force?

"Answer. My own experience in this connection indicates that the doubts of our friends abroad relate not to this country's ability but to its will and moral stamina; overcoming these doubts, therefore, requires continuingly responsible conduct of our affairs rather than a flurry of dramatic actions.

"The problem can be stated simply: If American goods are priced out of world markets, the result will be a decline in business and employment at home, attended by great social hardship and a weakening of our position in world affairs, attended by vulnerability to hostile forces.

"Fortunately, the solution is equally simple to state: The first requirement is that we balance our budget and keep our financial house in order, which means we must pay for the national needs expressed in the budget instead of giving IOU's or printing more paper dollars and thus driving prices up; the second requirement is that we increase our productivity and pass benefits therefrom to the consumer, thus raising our standard of living and fostering economic growth on a sustainable base. The way is clear. The will must be shown.

"Russell R. De Young, President, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

"Question. Mr. De Young, your company has just recently evidenced full faith in the future of our economy by embarking on its greatest expansion program. Isn't it only fair to assume that you cannot anticipate a realistic return on your investment in tomorrow—without the Government matching your confidence by providing adequate legislative and administrative protection for your continued right to compete in a free market?

"Answer. We have never been more confident in what the future holds for American industry than we are today.

"Goodyear is planning a capital expenditure this year of \$70 million as evidence of our faith in a sound recovery of the American economy.

"Our partners in this investment are the American people. They are represented, in

part, by over 100,000 employees and their families, our stockholders, our labor leaders, our suppliers, and our customers. Their stake in this investment is just as great as ours.

"And, under our system of government, these people—and their counterparts in every industry in the country—are the Government * * * and we have confidence in these people.

"Business today represents the many—not the few. If our investment in tomorrow is destroyed by thoughtless action by any faction—inside or outside of Government—the economic fall-out would radiate directly and indirectly into every State in the Union * * * including Alaska.

"Only healthy, vigorous, unshackled industry can pay taxes to support the many and vast governmental programs we have today. We are firmly convinced that the Government believes in taxes.

"Therefore, we are confident that the Government will protect its investment to the extent of permitting us a realistic return on our investment."

"ADDITIONAL REMARKS OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES RICHARD P. SMITH

"Ladies and gentlemen, we come now to a very proud moment for the business press—the presentation of its silver quill awards. You may be sure that there were many outstanding candidates recommended to the selection committee. However, there are no others more deserving of this highest tribute of the business press than those who are about to receive it. I think that it is high time that business began to speak up for its democratic rights in a more unified and more forceful manner. I feel that it is high time that real statesmanship is recognized by business. We are honored by the presence of a real statesman who is to make our silver quill presentations—a man beloved by the party which he leads in the Senate, respected by both Republicans and Democrats and esteemed by all who know him. Senator JOHNSON, the business press is and always will be honored by your presence. We are delighted to have you here to present our silver quill awards to former Speaker MARTIN and to Speaker RAYBURN.

"REMARKS OF SENATE MAJORITY LEADER LYNDON B. JOHNSON IN PRESENTING THE 1958 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., TO JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

"I would like to say to the members of National Business Publications that you are doubly fortunate in your choice—doubly fortunate because you have been doubly wise.

"JOE MARTIN has labored under some handicaps through the years. He was a Republican and he did not come from Texas.

"But there is one handicap under which JOE MARTIN has never had to labor. He has always had friends who bear in their inmost hearts a deep respect and a deep affection for him.

"I would like to say that I am one of those friends.

"There are many people who describe JOE MARTIN as a plain man. It is a word that is apt in many particulars.

"His integrity is plain for all to see. His devotion to his country is plain for all to see. And his dedication to duty is plain for all to see.

"These are qualities which have been tested in the court of critical opinion. And in every instance, JOE MARTIN has passed 100 percent.

"I learned to know him early when I came to Washington. I discovered in JOE MARTIN depths of sincerity; attributes of direct honesty and warm friendship for all of his colleagues.

"Over the years, there have been many occasions when I disagreed with JOE MARTIN. There have been many times when I thought

he was in error. But I never had the faintest suspicion that it was an error of the heart.

"And I have never known a time when JOE MARTIN's word was anything but good. Nobody needs to draw up a contract with him to insure compliance.

"Whenever an award is presented to any man, those who make the award must always face certain problems. The most important is the standard that is to be used in picking the recipient.

"What are the criteria that apply to JOE MARTIN?

"This is a man who loves his country.

"This is a man who serves his country.

"This is a man who is dedicated to his duty above all other considerations.

"This is a man who is a good and faithful servant of his convictions.

"JOE, this is an occasion which gives me more pleasure than it gives you.

"I am in a position tonight to pay tribute and honor to two close and trusted friends. I am in a position to say some of the things that are in my heart and have been in my heart for many years.

You and SAM RAYBURN will always be associated together in my mind. And you will always have a special place in the hearts of your countrymen.

"It is in that spirit that I present to you the Silver Quill Award.

"REMARKS OF JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, IN RECEIVING THE 1958 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., JANUARY 23, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C.

"Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, Speaker RAYBURN, Senator JOHNSON, distinguished guests, both of the local government and of abroad, my friends of the National Business Publications, I appreciate the generous reception you have given me. It will stimulate me in the years ahead, in giving more positive service to our common country. Believe me, Senator JOHNSON, I am deeply touched by your very generous words and the high standards you have attributed to me. I hope, Senator JOHNSON, that I may be worthy of these words you have uttered, coming as they do from a great Democratic leader whom we, in the course of our daily life, come into contact with—sometimes rather sharply, but always with a keen appreciation that our opponents are just as patriotic and just as American as we are.

"I am grateful beyond words to be selected to receive this twin Silver Quill Award—along with my old friend—time-honored friend—SAM. It is truly one of the greatest honors of my life and, of course, the fact that the trophy was made in Attleboro does not diminish from its value. SAM and I have shared a basic belief and I think it overshadows the differences between parties. Above all, we believe that we are trying to work out a life in America that will bring happiness and comfort to millions of people. We may have had different ways, sometimes, to approach the subject, but the goal in sight was always the same for either one of us. I believe that two men working with a common purpose can reach a goal. That is why I love America, because that is the way we solve the problems that we have in this great country of ours. We debate, we compromise and we arrive at the solution that means the best for America. Since I have this honor with SAM RAYBURN tonight, I want to say right here and now, he's one of the greatest Americans of this age. It is a rare privilege indeed, SAM, to be with you on this, which I consider a most joyous evening.

"I have enjoyed every one of these brilliant dinners in Washington, since they were initiated 7 years ago. I have witnessed six of the past awards to Paul Wootton, Vice President Nixon, former President Hoover, inventor Kettering, now deceased; my old friends of years, Senator HARRY BYRD, and

Ben Fairless. I consider this occasion each year to be unmatched anywhere in our time. I believe that it is of unusual benefit to the country to bring the leaders of our Government and of our industry together on such occasions. It can only develop a mutuality of respect and a greater understanding of each other's problems—and those of our country.

"I have always felt completely at home at this head table, far more than I do tonight. You see, I am an old editor and publisher and still keep a finger in the running of the hometown daily. So, there's no need to explain to you what I mean when I say that it's a very satisfying experience to know the smell of printer's ink.

"I have just a few more things to say tonight. I want to say something about our unrelenting requirements for a constant stream of new information concerning the technology of our modern way of life. I want to say something about the high purpose and integrity of the publishers who are represented by this outstanding organization, by this unduplicated dinner and by this magnificent audience.

"As you know, I've been in Congress for more than 35 years, having twice been Speaker of the House. During all that time, I have never known your people to ask for anything that they didn't honestly and fairly deserve and believe in. I have never heard you threaten to use the influence of your persuasive voice to obtain some purely selfish end. I have never been told of any attempt by your legislative representatives to exert undue pressure on the Members of Congress. How much better would be America if other organizations could say the same. We'd have a much better country.

"Instead, you've always been most unselfish, cooperative and understanding—as trustworthy sources of vital facts and figures. Instead, you've always been and you remain unequalled as channels of communication for the advancement of the trades, the sciences, the professions and the industries of America.

"Without your publications to spread the gospel of specialized knowhow and to bring about the quick exchange of adult education—I am confident that the progress of our economy could be retarded to a point where we might become a second-rate power. I am sure that the Speaker and Senator JOHNSON will agree with me that these are indeed substantial accomplishments and services you have rendered.

"We face today a most important period in our existence as a nation—our freedoms, our form of government, yes, even our very security are at stake. It's a great challenge we face and we must not fail in this decisive moment. The great struggle lies before us and you can rest assured that, in the days ahead, my single objective will be to contribute my experience, according to my conscientious judgment, to the progress and happiness of the country I love and the security of the peoples of the free world.

"I've been privileged by the Great Legislator of all mankind to live a long life. I have been blessed with many lasting memories of good friends and good times. However, I can assure you that this wonderful evening with the business press and this symbol of your friendship will be a most treasured memory which will last forever. And so, Senator JOHNSON, I'm very proud to accept at your hands the Silver Quill, coming as it does from a great organization for good in America. I'm glad, Speaker SAM, to share with you the honor because I know how richly you deserve it and I know it cannot fall but to inspire you, as it does me, to more intensive service for our common good in these days ahead. May God bless you all and keep you steadfast in your important work in helping to make America the great

country I think it is going to be in the days ahead.

"REMARKS OF SENATE MAJORITY LEADER LYNDON B. JOHNSON IN PRESENTING THE 1958 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., TO SAM RAYBURN

"I suppose SAM RAYBURN has listened to more spoken words than any other man now living.

"I also suspect he has heard more words of praise for himself than any other American who has ever lived.

"The first record was established because of the jobs he has held. And the second resulted from the way he has served in those jobs.

"SAM RAYBURN is one of those rare figures who has, during his active years of service, earned and received just recognition as a great American of his time.

"Because I know and love this great man, I am especially proud to have a part in this presentation. It is one of the most appropriate and most fitting ever given him.

"SAM RAYBURN has never proclaimed himself a special pleader for business. Neither has he done so for labor nor anyone else.

"If he has a special interest in his heart, it is the Fourth District of Texas and all of America.

"Yet the whole of SAM RAYBURN's service has been dedicated to one end: the building of a stronger Nation and the advancement of an expanding free economy.

"SAM RAYBURN has had faith in the capacity of a free system to produce. Basically, I believe such a faith is and will always be the business community's first interest. For it is when the men at the top of our Government begin to falter in that faith that the system itself begins to manifest the symptoms of internal illness.

"SAM RAYBURN has had a high sense of dedication to the concept of responsible capitalism. Look at our economy today. There is at the moment no more vital symbol of confidence than our stock market. Yet it was largely due to SAM RAYBURN's vision and courage, his mule-headedness, that Congress, a quarter-century ago, laid the foundations for the public confidence which now abounds in our securities system.

"This is one example of many.

"With the passing of the years, many have forgotten that SAM RAYBURN in the 1930's was the legislative architect of the reforms which reinforced the base of our free enterprise system in the field of securities, utilities, communications, transportation, and many more.

"For business today, this concept of responsible capitalism may well be the most important concept with which free enterprise works.

"Business is facing up to the fact that it is not articulate at home. Business must, I am convinced, also face the fact it is not sufficiently articulate abroad.

"We live in a world which does not use the American definition of capital. Abroad, even in our own hemisphere, capital carries a connotation which no longer jibes—if it ever did—with the American meaning.

"Our greatest single challenge over the next quarter century may well be to spell out for other nations the American definition of responsible capitalism.

"Men who believe in the future as SAM RAYBURN does are indispensable to this labor.

"SAM RAYBURN believed in the future of American enterprise in days when many businessmen themselves had lost faith. But for the faith of this man, and the abiding confidence he inspired in others about him, we might have made a ruinous turn and have never come to the abundance we now experience.

"Mr. Speaker, to you I would express, not merely as a friend, but as a student and as an admirer, gratitude which this award sym-

bolizes—and commemorates—for the leadership you have afforded.

"Some have described you as 'Mr. Texas.' Others have called you 'Mr. Democrat.' But I suggest it might be more fitting if you were identified as 'Mr. Confidence.'"

"For your confidence has kept our Nation on course in times of test.

"Your confidence has held our Nation above the bogs of partisanship.

"Your confidence has been a keystone in the arch of prosperity over the lives of all the people, in business, in labor, on the farms, the whole of our society.

"It is my honor, my very happy honor, I should say, to present you the Silver Quill Award for 1958.

"REMARKS OF SAM RAYBURN, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, IN RECEIVING THE 1958 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC., JANUARY 23, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C.

"Mr. Chairman, members of this organization, my old fellow worker, JOE MARTIN, and my partial friend, LYNDON JOHNSON, I thank you all. To be a recipient of this token of your respect means a great deal to me, as it does to my friend JOE. JOE and I have been in the House of Representatives for a long time. I a little longer than he. We have sat on different sides of the aisle. We have belonged to different parties and we have changed positions in the House of Representatives several times. He has taken the gavel away from me twice and I want to say that that gavel was never in more honest or more capable hands in all the history of the speakership than when it was in the hands of JOE MARTIN.

"I have had many honors. People have given me everything that I have asked them to give. I have now served continuously in the House of Representatives longer than any other man in the history of the House of Representatives. I have served as Speaker of the House of Representatives 6 years longer than any other man in the history of the House of Representatives ever served. Somebody was talking to me a while ago and said, 'You can talk freely because we're not going to quote you.' 'Well,' I said, 'go ahead and quote everything that you want to quote, because I am one man in American politics who can't be hurt. I've already had mine and nobody can take that away.'"

"JOE MARTIN and I have been disciples of the doctrine that legislation should never be passed to punish anybody, any group or any sector or any section of our country. But, that legislation should be passed to bring about justice, fairplay and equal opportunity among all of our people. I can remember when people, who didn't understand, said—as LYNDON referred to in the early thirties—that when I was handling a bill to control issues of securities that I was going to stop the circulation of any kind of securities in interstate commerce. I had no such idea. I wanted clean securities and I think today—and not many months or years after that bill passed the House of Representatives—that the good, honest issuers of securities in this country are proud that the desperados and the cheats have been driven out of their midst.

"Then, along came the Stock Exchange Regulation Act. The unthinking and the unknowing said that that bill was going to close the stock exchanges. My answer to that was that I was further from wanting to close the stock exchanges than they were. Of course, they do business and do things that no other organization can do. We have passed a clean Securities Act and now we want a clean place in which to buy, sell, and exchange securities. It might be news to you for me to say, that, for many years after that bill passed, every president of the New York Stock Exchange, after he was elected, came to my office and said to me

that they wouldn't be governor of the New York Stock Exchange if it were not for that bill. 'Because,' they said, 'we, as some others who have been on the exchange, might get into bad trouble.'

"So, when people say that we are unknowing, that we do not understand that the problems of business are the problems of our country, just remember that 435, now 436, honest men and women—selected men and women—chosen after contest, are down here in Washington trying to do and are doing their best for you and for all of the other American people. We're not perfect. We make mistakes, as everybody does, but we are as willing and as ready to acknowledge those mistakes and try to cure them as anybody else.

"The committees of Congress hunger and thirst for men of your type and character who understand business, who understand the trends, who have a patriotic desire to make things better, not only for business but for all the people of the country. They welcome you before those committees and they thirst for the information that you have, as it is helpful to them in arriving at a just and a fair conclusion before they report a bill and have it placed on the calendar of the Senate or the House of Representatives.

"I saw a letter today that someone published and sent out to business people—I won't mention the name of the sheet because I wouldn't want to advertise it, since somebody might be peculiar and want to buy it—it said I was a dangerous radical, that I was a collectivist and a few other adjectives like that—I would hate to repeat, in LYNDON's presence, what it said about him. But, the person who wrote it was writing something that he thought somebody would buy and somebody would believe. So, come down and visit with us—and come to know us.

"Usually, the average man says, 'Oh, my Congressman's all right but that other 435. If all were like my Congressman.' Well, the people in the district of the other fellow think just as much of their Congressman as you do of yours and, sometimes, when they get so they don't like theirs, they make a little change.

"Now, I'm not going to say anything about politics this evening but I will say this, since the election on November 4, I've heard more about balance than I'd ever heard in the same length of time before. We've had some of that here this evening and I hope we'll balance so that everybody will have a fair chance. Let me say again—without wearying you, because I realize, as you do, that it is getting to the shank of the evening and you may be a little tired—how deeply appreciative I am of this honor that you have conferred upon me. It will be one of my prize possessions that will go in my library at my home town of Bonham, Tex.

"I want to say to you again, as JOE MARTIN suggested, that in this dangerous world in which we live—and I think it is the most dangerous world, fraught with more things to disturb people than any other time since Christian civilization began—we in the Congress are going to sift recommendations for money and for legislation. We are going to try to do the things that will put our country in a posture of defense both militarily and economically, because we cannot be in a posture of military defense and not be in a great posture of economic defense. We're going to appropriate the money that we think necessary to make our country so strong, in both directions, that no international desperado will ever dare to try to set foot upon the sacred soil of the United States of America.

"And so, in closing, let me again say what a great honor it is to be with you this evening and to receive this tribute in connection with one of the same sort given to an old friend. I wish that each of you, throughout the years which are allotted to you, may en-

joy to the fullest extent the rich blessings of health, a reasonable degree of prosperity, and one day, under God, that this Nation and all good peoples throughout the world may look toward a peace that will be enduring."

FARGO CITY COMMISSIONERS SEEK BENSON RESIGNATION

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the dissatisfaction with the farm policies of this administration, which has existed in rural areas for some time, now appears to be in evidence in the cities also. So great has been the concern that we find an American city for the first time calling for the resignation of Secretary Ezra Taft Benson.

I have just received a communication from Herschel Lashkowitz, mayor of the city of Fargo, N. Dak., advising me that a pronouncement, which was signed by every member of the Fargo City Commission, was read at the commission meeting held February 3, 1959, and I was further advised that, pursuant to the understanding of the city commission, I be requested to insert the pronouncement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The pronouncement reads as follows:

Throughout this general area people are keenly interested in the growth, progress and economic development of the city of Fargo and its inhabitants. Correspondingly, the people of Fargo are also keenly interested in economic conditions and the well-being of its friends and neighbors in surrounding rural areas.

It is universally recognized these days that our economy is an interdependent economy, and that which adversely affects agriculture sooner or later has an adverse effect on business, labor and the general public. It has now been clearly established that one vital segment of the economy such as agriculture cannot suffer without there being cumulative effects on the rest of the people. Therefore, the interdependence of agriculture, industry, business and labor must be recognized.

Fargo is the center of a great farm belt and our people depend upon agriculture for their sustenance and livelihood. Therefore Fargo, like any agricultural community, cannot afford to stand back and permit the deterioration of our agricultural economy, and the continuing decline of farm income, accompanied by the general accelerated move away from the farm.

The news reported by the Associated Press as late as last Saturday, January 31, was headlined "Farm Income To Decrease by Many Millions—Benson Shakes Up Price Supports in Agriculture," and heralds the downward spiral of farm income and its ultimate effect on this area and our people.

Therefore, recognizing that the peril of agriculture is the peril of all citizens in this area whether they live in villages, towns, or cities, or on the farm, we call for the immediate resignation of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, whose policies have contributed to this unfortunate decline in our agricultural economy and farm income. We regret that Secretary Benson, by his policies, appears to regard farmers and

farms as just so many increments or statistics on a chart, and Secretary Benson also appears by his policies to lack feeling or concern for the plight of the individual farmer.

The Benson policy, as announced and administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, can only mean eventual ruination to many of our family farms and imposes a cumulative unfortunate effect on the rest of our economy.

In the event Mr. Benson does not submit his resignation, we respectfully call on the President of the United States to ask for Mr. Benson's resignation and to replace the Secretary of Agriculture with a new face and a new policy, based upon determined bipartisan attempts to help restore farm income and save the family-sized farm.

FARGO CITY COMMISSION.

Meeting of February 3, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, the farm policies of Secretary Benson, which have caused surpluses to mount, prices to decline, and administration costs to rise, and which were again ratified in the President's farm message, must be brought to an end. It should be the duty of this Congress to enact legislation which will bring about parity of income to the farmer, and increase purchasing power on the mainstreets of our cities and towns. This should be our duty despite the possibility of a Presidential veto.

GOOD OPPORTUNITIES FOR FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, each year during the week of George Washington's birthday the Nation pays tribute to the Future Farmers of America. This year the period of February 22d through the 28th has been designated as "National Future Farmers of America Week." It is quite fitting that the anniversary of George Washington's birth should be the occasion for focusing attention on this national farm organization, for Washington is a sort of patron saint of the Future Farmers of America. Our first President was also this country's first scientific farmer and on his farm called Mount Vernon he experimented with new crops, new tools, new methods of cultivation and fertilization. He advocated and practiced the rotation of crops to conserve the soil, long before that practice became general. Washington could not benefit from the wealth of information available to farmers today through agricultural colleges, experiment stations and other agencies of the Government. He had to rely on "Doing to learn," a phrase in the FFA Motto, and an integral part of the program of the Future Farmers of America. Washington conducted endless experiments, carefully recording all the information he obtained, designed and built some of his tools, and even tried various systems of marketing to find the one that would give the best return for his crops. The FFA honors Washington not only for his practical contributions to the advancement of agriculture and his early

recognition of the need for soil conservation, but also for his love of country life.

The national FFA organization was launched at Kansas City, Mo., in 1928 and on August 30, 1950, a Federal charter was granted to the Future Farmers of America through passage of Public Law 740, during the 81st Congress of the United States. Had I been a Member of Congress at that time, the vote of the second congressional district would most certainly have been cast for passage of this law. I know of no national student organization more deserving of praise than the Future Farmers of America for by their very existence we are assured that the farmer of tomorrow will be prepared to meet the increasing demands both at home and abroad for agricultural products.

In this age of mechanization and the application of science to all phases of production agriculture has not been neglected. Research is constantly being conducted to improve the quality of our crops and on today's mechanized farm the latest methods of soil conservation, scientific breeding, crop rotation, and contour planting are utilized to get the maximum production per acre. Vocational education in agriculture—a nationwide program of systematic instruction in agriculture and farm mechanics conducted in public high schools all over the country—is providing the technical knowledge and practical know-how required of the success farmer of tomorrow. Enrollment in vocational agriculture is a prerequisite to membership in the Future Farmers of America. It is through application of their vocational training the FFA members are able to carry out the programs and projects of their organization. Vocational agriculture and the FFA constitute the most effective program yet developed for training boys to be good farmers and helping them to become established in the farming occupations of their choice.

In the Second Congressional District of Kentucky we have many chapters of the Future Farmers of America and we have only to look at the achievements of the members of this organization to realize the influence for good they are exerting on their rural communities. This influence is continued to be felt as many members of the FFA pass on into the ranks of the Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, and other agricultural and civic groups, there to accept and to fill creditably places of trust and responsibility while still in their youth.

I am in wholehearted agreement with the FFA creed which begins with the declaration "I believe in the future of farming," and I also believe that there are good opportunities for good farmers. There has been much discussion in recent years of the farm problem with low prices resulting from surplus production; however, the longtime outlook is good, because our population is increasing so rapidly that more and more farm products are needed every year. The Future Farmers of America will be depended upon, by an ever-expanding population, for the supplies of nutritious foods and other agricultural products that will

keep our people healthy. It is comforting to know that the future of American agriculture will be in the hands of well-trained, civic-minded citizens who are dedicated to the principle that abundant agricultural production is the backbone of America's strength.

Mr. Speaker, an outstanding example of a good farmer who is preparing himself to accept the agricultural opportunities of the future is Danny Duvall, 18, of Rural Route 7, Bowling Green, Ky. At the 21st farm awards luncheon held in Louisville, Ky., on Saturday, February 14, 1959, this young gentleman from my home town in Warren County was chosen top Future Farmer of America in Kentucky. Danny Duvall has a 50-50 partnership with his father, Marvin, on their 120-acre farm. Presently a senior at Bristow High School in Bowling Green, he will farm full time upon graduation. Danny is a member of the Junior Conservation Club, Farm Bureau, and Jersey Cattle Club, and has also participated in several FFA public-speaking contests. Danny Duvall's selection for this top FFA award demonstrates the truly commendable work being done by this fine organization in my section of Kentucky.

GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent and past events regretfully bring to light the fact that our good neighbor policy toward our Latin American friends demands immediate attention if the Western Hemisphere is to achieve a maximum degree of strength in time of emergency and a maximum degree of prosperity in time of peace. We have too long taken for granted our friendship with our neighbors to the South. Our attitude of complacency has sowed the seeds of misunderstanding to the detriment of our best interests as well as theirs.

It is with a distinct pride that I point to the efforts of Florida's able and outstanding Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, and the contributions he has made toward promoting good relations between the United States and Latin America. Over the years he has repeatedly warned of the events that would take place and which did take place with the pursuit of a "de-emphasis" policy. His vision, foresight and brilliant analysis has earned for him the highest respect both in and out of the Congress, in the field of United States-Latin American relations. He has made inestimable contributions to his country's well-being. Floridians have a particular pride in all his many accomplishments—accomplishments for which the Nation itself will be forever indebted, and which have marked him as a national leader.

By virtue of the leadership of this distinguished son of Florida, progress is being made in effectively doing some-

thing about the deterioration that has taken place in our relations with our South American friends who have contributed so much to the well-being and defense of this great country of ours.

On January 31, Senator GEORGE SMATHERS delivered a brilliant and enlightening speech demonstrating his remarkable leadership in Latin American affairs at a dinner honoring President Frondizi, of Argentina, at Miami Beach, Fla. The contents of Senator SMATHERS' remarks, calling for a revision in our policy dealing with military assistance to Latin American countries in order that greater concentration can be given to promoting a stable economy in the area, should be considered by every Member of Congress.

Let me review for you that important speech:

Senor Presidente, General Frondizi; Your Excellencies; my favorite Congressman, DANTE FASCELL; county commissioners and public officials; friends of Argentina all—y mis amigos.

A pesar de que estudie castellano por tres años en la Universidad de Florida, espera que usted perdone mi inabilidad para hablarlo. Yo no se si mi profesor no era muy bueno, o si yo soy muy esturido, pero he llegado a la conclusion de que la culpa no fue de mi profesor.

La semana pasada estuve presente en la sesion solemne del Congreso donde escuché su discurso. Queremos que usted sepa que su vista significa mucho en el curso de las relaciones de nuestros países.

Admiramos su lucha contra la tiranía y su esfuerzo para rehabilitar las instituciones democráticas.

Espera que nuestra compania le haga sentirse como si estuviera en su casa.

Con su permiso, Senor Presidente, continuare hablando en Ingles para que me entiendan las personas que no hablan castellano. Creo que usted tambien me entendera mejor por medio de su interprete.

For those of you who speak only English, let me explain that I've just been saying a few words of welcome to our distinguished guest in Spanish—my Spanish.

As for those of you who do speak Spanish, surely after my rendition, you must recall the story about Mark Twain, who spent a number of years as a Mississippi River boat pilot. He had a riverman's flair for picturesque speech, including an astonishing vocabulary of swear words, which he delighted in exercising.

It is said that Mrs. Twain tried for many years to break him of the habit. She coaxed, she begged, she cajoled—all without success.

Finally, she decided she'd try showing him how terrible it sounded. She made a list of the curses Mark Twain used, until she had about 5 minutes' worth, and one day, in the midst of a family conversation, she pulled it out and in what she conceived to be the proper manner, read it off.

Mark Twain heard her through to the end. Then he smiled and said: "My dear, you've got all the right words—but you haven't got the tune."

So it is with me and my Spanish. I speak it like a rock'n roll band playing Mozart. I trust, however, that my efforts this evening haven't permanently damaged United States-Latin American relations. But I'm trying and I'm sure the Presidente knows the purity of my intentions, even if not the purity of my Castilian.

2

I know you all join me in extending the most enthusiastic of greetings to this courageous leader who directs the destiny of a great sister republic at a critical moment in its history.

As many of you know, during my 12 years in the Congress I have talked long and feelingly on the need to improve relationships between Latin America and the United States. I've made some headway, but it's been only a pigmy step.

However, in a few minutes before the Congress, in a speech which, next to Sir Winston Churchill's, was the most eloquent, moving, and logical that I've heard in 12 years—President Frondizi made the case for Latin America. He quickly bridged the gap. He suddenly opened the eyes of all to the true meaning and urgency of good Latin-American relationships. Mr. President, your speech was a verbal ICBM—a missile of goodness, of democracy, of friendship, of ideals and ideas. In a few seconds, you spanned the gap between Argentina and the United States. I commend you for a superlative performance.

II

Today we all know that a powerful surge of democratic spirit is sweeping through the Americas.

The revolution that toppled Peron and elevated Senor Frondizi was the first in a series of popular uprisings which have thinned the ranks of the dictators, almost to the vanishing point. We here hope democracy will now prevail, for we know it to be the only system which allows the full expression of man's dignity, and capacity, and worth.

We in the United States have been justifiably and wisely chary—ever since we discarded gunboat diplomacy—of appearing to force others to do things our way. We do not insist that the governments of the Americas be modeled in our image.

Quite naturally, differences in experience and temperament are going to result in a variety of political systems. The choice is not ours to make—nor should it be.

But we are hopeful that democracy will prove to be contagious. We believe in democracy, we define it as did the historian Merle Curti, "as the doctrine that all men possess, a sacred, irrevocable right to govern themselves and to reach for the stars."

But, as President Frondizi so eloquently and incisively reminded us in his address to the Congress, victory over dictatorship is not automatically followed by the words: "And they lived happily ever after."

In Argentina, dictatorship left behind a terrible political and economic wreckage as it did in the other republics which have thrown off the yoke.

The present government is still plowing through the initial posttyranny stage, clearing away the debris of ruined lives, repairing and reconstructing the shattered foundations of democracy, reshaping the twisted superstructure of the economy.

President Frondizi told us his biggest challenge still lies ahead.

So this is the first lesson: That freedom and democracy will endure in Latin America only as they prove to be the right weapons for overpowering the misery and poverty which still disfigure too much of Latin America.

We should know by now that hemispheric prosperity cannot be plucked from a tree like an orange. It has to be built arduously brick by brick. But we also know that this awesome task is best begun by people who share generally the same ideals, the same goals. That was the history of our own colonies, and that was the history of our own States.

Today the United States and Argentina, under Frondizi, stand on common soil, sharing the same ideals, the same hopes and aspirations. We are finally on the same side—and we must help our teammate as we would expect to be helped.

We in the United States know that defense of our own freedom depends heavily on the strength of the other Americas, on their ability to withstand, over the long

haul, both the lure and menace of communism.

I sometimes feel that for the past 12 years I've been as tiresome on this point as an overexposed television series. Unfortunately, my message is ever a new one, because too few seem to listen, or to care. Most of you have heard me urge our Government to develop an active and systematic co-operation with our sister republics, individually and collectively. You have heard me plead for funds to wipe off this hemisphere the diseases which cancel the energies of our peoples. You have heard me press for a more liberal Export-Import Bank policy; for greater sympathy toward Latin American petitions to the Development Loan Fund; for the creation of a separate inter-American bank; for more technical assistance; for a truly dramatic student exchange program, the one single program that can raise the level of intelligence and improve understanding like no other.

These pleas have reverberated off the walls of the Senate, and the ears of the State Department, with disconcerting ineffectiveness. Still, I would not say the efforts have been wasted or completely unavailing.

Recently our government has awakened from its preoccupation with Europe and Asia to recognize the validity of the Inter-American Bank proposal. We all are now for it. In addition, under some pressure, they have stepped up technical aid and recently made some sensible loans, one of them to Argentina.

Meanwhile, there is one aspect of United States policy which seems to me to require a thorough airing. That is the question of military aid and military missions to the American republics.

The news earlier this month that we planned to send 54 Marines to Haiti has caused a great deal of worried comment, both in Congress and out.

Without a fuller explanation than has thus far been forthcoming from either the State or Defense Departments, it is difficult for me to see what military interest of the United States this mission is intended to serve.

It would appear very much as if we are deliberately walking into the middle of the explosive Caribbean situation with our eyes shut to the consequences, like a man in a top hat parading past a boy with a snowball.

I am not going to belabor this point tonight. But it's clear that the only fact that is apparent at this moment is that our military missions to Latin America have created a great deal of misunderstandings and ill feeling on a number of counts, nor have their advantages yet been demonstrated.

No one, for example, can get around the fact that American military supplies have been used in at least one instance, and perhaps more than once, to support unpopular regimes in power.

The military mission and aid to Cuba during the Batista regime is today a very sore point in Cuba. Some Cubans claim that Batista turned those weapons sent by the United States on the revolutionaries. On the other hand, the pro-Batista people were unhappy because they claimed our Government stopped the supply of weapons at the critical moment. What the facts are, I don't pretend to know—except that we are abused by both sides, and the purposes of the military mission are grossly misunderstood.

Similar charges were heard in Colombia after the overthrow of Rojas Pinilla. In this case, the evidence was rather clear. I have myself seen pictures of United States cannons and United States shells in action against the people leading the revolution.

It seems to me axiomatic that we cannot claim to support democracy if our weapons are used to enslave people.

Of course, I'm familiar with the argument that these weapons and military missions

are intended solely to increase the effectiveness of hemisphere defense.

I doubt the validity of the assertion.

So far as I can see, it rests on the theory that world war III, if it comes, God forbid, will be fought with the same weapons and on the same strategic plan as was World War II.

How else to explain the decision last year to turn over 11 outmoded destroyers to various Latin American governments?

I have been advised by competent military men that these destroyers would be utterly worthless for tracking down and destroying modern submarines with their atomic power and payloads.

As Khrushchev and Mikoyan has so often said, the real battlefield of the future will be social and economic—and if a shooting war cannot be avoided, it will be fought, not with battleships and carriers and long campaigns through South and Central America, but with hydrogen warheads and missiles delivered across the roof of the world to primary targets in the United States.

To arm and train the hemisphere countries in the changing techniques of nuclear war is beyond our capacity, what with our staggering commitments on the very periphery of the Soviet Union.

Let's not fool ourselves. The outmoded military aid which we make available to Latin America and force on our neighbors in some instances, does not relieve the United States in any appreciable fashion of its present responsibilities for hemisphere defense.

This program does—indeed it already has created a special set of problems all its own.

In addition to those mentioned, it oftentimes upsets the balance of power among the individual republics. The 11-destroyer deal which our military sought to push through Congress last year, and which I blocked, would have given a destroyer to Peru, but not to Ecuador—thereby causing Ecuadorians to grow excited and conclude we had taken Peru's side in the long struggle between those two fine countries.

Aside from the matter of national pride, which is not unimportant, arms for one nation and not others in equal amounts creates uncertainty and fear. It seems that the United States is taking a hand in affairs which are really none of its concern.

Moreover, arming Latin America with outmoded weapons is a clear invitation to disaster. It is building a shell around a vacuum and diverting needed energies from more vital tasks. When we send them equipment, we put a heavy burden for maintenance on already overburdened treasuries. In several countries, the resulting strain could be the difference between success and failure of the democratic experiment.

In addition to the financial aspects, there is the waste of human resources which results from diversion of some of the hemisphere's finest minds into essentially unproductive work—and to what purpose?

To furnish the illusion of defense—an illusion, let me add, that is as dangerous to our own state of mind as it is to the political and economic stability of our sister republics.

Several countries are already beginning to reach this verdict on their own. Mexico informed us, a while back, that it wants none of our military missions or our weapons. Should we wait until the other countries reach the same conclusion?

It seems to me that we ought to restudy and reconsider now. In the long run, the future of Latin America depends, not on the "availability" of World War II weapons to fight a war which will never be fought.

No; Latin America's future rests with schooling its citizens in the democratic process and with a frontal assault on poverty, illiteracy and misery.

Should we in the United States not ask ourselves would we not be making a sounder contribution to the strength of the things in which we believe, if we called off our missions of agronomists and substituted missions of agronomists and public health specialists, of engineers and educators?

President Frondizi seems to me to personify the new direction that we should take in Latin America.

As the first Argentine President to visit the United States while in office, he has set the tone for a new era, the end of a long period of estrangement, and the start, I hope, of a new and brilliant period of co-operation.

Our two countries lie almost at the extremes of the Western Hemisphere. If the United States and Argentina can come together and replace former differences and misunderstanding with understanding, then indeed there is real hope for revival of a meaningful Good Neighbor policy.

Again, Senor Presidente, welcome. We are gratified and proud of your presence and wish for you and the Argentine people a fulfillment of their dreams. May this meeting symbolize the linkage of North and South America and the sincerity of our desire for a richer and fuller life for all.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

By unanimous consent, permission to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL, for 5 minutes, today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BREEDING, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next.

Mr. ALFORD, for 50 minutes, on Wednesday next.

Mr. FLOOD, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, February 25.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday next, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROUSH, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday next.

Mr. MILLIKEN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. REES of Kansas, for 10 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. METCALF, for 60 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCormack), on Wednesday next, for 1 hour.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER.

Mr. MONAGAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE in two instances.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WRIGHT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PIRNIE.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. GRAY.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. DAGUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AVERY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FASCELL (at the request of Mr. McCormack) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAMPLER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 17, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

557. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, relative to International Labor Conference Convention No. 105, pursuant to article 19 of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization (H. Doc. No. 78); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

558. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, relative to the cooperative program of the United States with Mexico for the control and the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the period July 1, 1958, to December 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

559. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the General Sales Manager on Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies, activities, and dispositions for the month of December 1958; to the Committee on Appropriations.

560. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on the progress of the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps flight training program covering the period August 1, 1956, to December 1, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 879, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

561. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting additional information relating to a letter dated July 29, 1958, concerning the proposed disposition of approximately 13,860,000 ounces of quinine now held in the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

562. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to widows and children of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service Division, who were retired or whose death occurred prior to the effective date of such amendments of 1957"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

563. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to facilitate the acquisition of real property under the District of Columbia

Alley Dwelling Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

564. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act regulating the bringing of actions for damages against the District of Columbia, approved February 28, 1933"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

565. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Sugar Act program, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957; to the Committee on Government Operations.

566. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the fiscal year 1957 entitlements to Federal payments to meet a share of local school district current expenditures for those school districts located in federally affected areas, pursuant to Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

567. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

568. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of December 31, 1958, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

569. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 78), relating to the establishment of the DeSoto National Memorial, in the State of Florida"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

570. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, relative to a draft of a bill which would amend section 251 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

571. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, relative to the case of *Georgia Kaolin Company v. The United States* (No. Congressional 7-55), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and to House Resolution 250, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

572. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report relative to war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of December 31, 1958, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

573. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide, in the event of an emergency evacuation, certain authority relating to the pay of civilian officers and employees on duty outside the United States or at other places designated by the President"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

574. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters"; to the Committee on Public Works.

575. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, relative to the case of *Olga Mirko Bjeletic* relating to the order for denial, pursuant to the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of February 9, 1959, the following bill was reported on February 13, 1959:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4245. A bill relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted February 16, 1959]

Under clause 21 of rule XI, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 171. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 4245, a bill relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H.R. 4473. A bill to provide a constitutional bill of rights to guarantee and protect the inherent natural rights (including the rights to freedom of speech, press, and assembly and due process and equal protection under the law), of members of labor organizations within their labor unions; to establish standards and procedures for the election and removal of officers and other representatives of labor organizations in order to protect the right of members of labor organizations to be represented by representatives of their own choosing; to reinforce the rights of members of labor organizations with respect to funds and property, and create fiduciary duties and responsibilities with respect to the administration, disbursement, and reporting of funds of labor organizations by their officials; to prevent abuses in the establishment and administration of trusteeships by labor organizations; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4474. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 4475. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4476. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4477. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers by railroads engaged in interstate commerce by requiring such carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4478. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4479. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual

to waive his right to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4480. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4481. A bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 4482. A bill to amend section 12 of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 4483. A bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1086, 43 U.S.C., sec. 36b), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4484. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 4485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4486. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a personal exemption for a foreign student who resides in his home while in the United States attending high school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYLE:

H.R. 4487. A bill to amend section 17 of the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4488. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 4489. A bill to provide a particular designation for the proposed dam and lock on the Chattahoochee River at Columbia, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 4490. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.R. 4491. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price support for whole milk, butterfat, and their products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 4492. A bill to make the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 applicable to retired former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and to their widows, widowers, and children; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4493. A bill to provide home leave to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 4494. A bill to amend section 34a of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase the term of office of referees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4495. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4496. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital of 1,500 beds at Bay Pines, Fla.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4497. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4498. A bill to provide a program of national health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4499. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 4500. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 4501. A bill to provide a termination date for the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4502. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4503. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Correction of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4504. A bill to amend section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit stock of a small business corporation which is owned by a husband and wife to be treated as owned by a single shareholder for purposes of determining the number of shareholders of such corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 4505. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from

benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 4506. A bill requiring the use of surplus agricultural commodities in carrying out certain foreign aid programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4507. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, and distribution of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 4508. A bill relating to the income-tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4509. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to extend its operation for 5 years; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H.R. 4510. A bill to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 4511. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4512. A bill to terminate excise taxes on facilities and services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 4513. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H.R. 4514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to continue the exclusion, from the basis of certain excise taxes, of discounts and rebates for cooperative local advertising; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEMENT W. MILLER:

H.R. 4516. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful education, training, and employment for boys and young men; to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, range, and of recreational areas; and to provide assistance and relief to the school administrations of the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4517. A bill to provide certain survivor annuities from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide accounting procedures whereby dealers in personal property may exclude from gross income amounts withheld by banks and finance companies on notes purchased from such dealers employing the accrual method of accounting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 4519. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase, from \$1,200 to \$2,700 in the case of a married person or a widow with minor children and from \$1,200 to \$1,800 in the case of any other individual,

the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4520. A bill to provide for the construction of a new Federal post office building in Port Allen, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4521. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ an administrative assistant; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4522. A bill to establish reciprocal import quotas upon the importation of confectionery and chocolate into the United States from foreign countries which impose quotas upon imports of confectionery and chocolate from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for payment of a pension of \$100 per month to World War I veterans who have attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4524. A bill extending the time in which the Boston National Historic Sites Commission shall complete its work; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4525. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4526. A bill to provide for the award of the Good Conduct Medal to certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4527. A bill to provide that persons who served in the Army or Navy during World War I may, if they possess certain qualifications, wear the distinguished and Presidential unit emblems and combat infantryman's and medical badges; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 4528. A bill to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 4529. A bill to govern the salaries and personnel practices applicable to teachers, certain school officers, and other employees of the dependents schools of the Department of Defense in overseas areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4530. A bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4531. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government stationed in Alaska to accumulate a maximum of 45 days a year annual leave; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4532. A bill to amend section 1552, title 10, United States Code, and section 301 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide that the Board for the Cor-

rection of Military or Naval Records and the Boards of Review, Discharges, and Dismissals shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4533. A bill to amend section 410 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that all retired members of the uniformed services who served not less than 20 years on active duty, or who were retired for disability in excess of 50 percent, and who die after 1956 shall be considered to have died service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4534. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4535. A bill to establish an additional judicial district within the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H.R. 4536. A bill to provide pension for widows and children of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict on the same basis as pension is provided for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 4537. A bill to appropriate \$302,000 for advanced engineering and design for the Mississinewa Dam and Reservoir, \$202,000 for advanced engineering and design for the Salamonie Dam and Reservoir and \$202,000 for advanced engineering and design for the Huntington Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 4538. A bill authorizing El Paso County, Tex., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande at or near the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 4539. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4540. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be paid compensation at the rate of \$2.50 per day for each day spent in hiding during World War II or the Korean conflict to evade capture by the enemy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 4541. A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H.R. 4542. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4543. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIER:

H.R. 4544. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the mini-

mum wage under the act to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.J. Res. 242. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREEDING:

H.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (By request):

H.J. Res. 244. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate and proclaim a National Aircraft Dispatcher's Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 245. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 246. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration to be held in 1963 at various locations in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.J. Res. 248. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 172. Resolution favoring the application of the principle of self-determination to the people of Cyprus in accordance with a tentative agreement between Greece and Turkey whereby British approval is sought for a plan to make Cyprus an independent republic under several restrictive agreements in her Constitution for self-government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H. Res. 173. Resolution favoring the application of the principle of self-determination to the people of Cyprus in accordance with a tentative agreement between Greece and Turkey whereby British approval is sought for a plan to make Cyprus an independent republic under several restrictive agreements in her Constitution for self-government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting enactment of a law admitting the Territory of Hawaii to statehood in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the preservation of strength of the National Guard in Montana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoring statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to early construction of the proposed Bowman Haley Dam and Reservoir project and urging the Corps of Engineers to expedite the completion of a favorable report thereon; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the preservation of water rights of the individual and the States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protesting the concentration of military shipping from California ports; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to the proceeds derived from the mineral leasing of Federal Government lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to consideration of legislation designed to authorize the States to issue birth certificates to foreign children adopted by U.S. citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4545. A bill for the relief of Allan Gordon-Foster; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 4546. A bill for the relief of Margaret P. Copin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 4547. A bill for the relief of Frederick Hing Lung Fung and Christopher Hing Kui Fung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4548. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sadie Latoufe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4549. A bill for the relief of Jacob Naggar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 4550. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Milewski and his minor son, Wieslaw Milewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4551. A bill for the relief of the Union Trust Co. of Maryland; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 4552. A bill for the relief of Lambert Kwok, Nancy Li Kwok, and Evelyn Chi Ngan Kwok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4553. A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Filippelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4554. A bill for the relief of Irene Hryciw, Krystyna Hryciw, and Ewa Hryciw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASEM:

H.R. 4555. A bill for the relief of Anatolijs Janitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4556. A bill for the relief of Mel-Chiau Lo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 4557. A bill for the relief of Roy Baptiste Weston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4558. A bill for the relief of Austin L. Knowlton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4559. A bill to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property situated in the State of Louisiana to Manuel Bermudez and his heirs, successors, and assigns; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4560. A bill for the relief of Santo Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H.R. 4561. A bill for the relief of Sun Ae Ja Conner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 4562. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Grzelewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4563. A bill for the relief of Dr. Te Yong Lou, Mrs. Tran Lam Lou, and Tseng Ming Lou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 4564. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Abrams Abramowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

72. By Mr. IRWIN: Petition of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut pertaining to Federal excise taxes on telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

73. By Mr. KOWALSKI: Petition of the State of Connecticut Public Utilities Com-

mission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

74. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the vice president, Pacific Gas & Electric Co., San Francisco, Calif., relative to a resolution adopted by the Western Regional Conference of the Public Utilities Advertising Association of America requesting statehood for Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

75. Also, petition of the secretary, Lithuanian American Council, Inc., Racine, Wis., relative to a resolution adopted which expresses sincere gratitude to the U.S. Government for its efforts to aid all people seeking freedom from communism, and insisting on withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

76. Also, petition of the president, the 442d Veterans Club, Honolulu, T.H., requesting that appropriate action be taken to grant immediate statehood to Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Hon. Alan Bible, of Nevada,
Before the Almas Temple Shrine Club,
Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 16, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] made a very interesting speech before the Almas Temple Shrine Club in Washington, D.C. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALAN BIBLE, ALMAS TEMPLE SHRINE CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 13, 1959

Fellow nobles, I deem it a real pleasure and a distinct honor to be afforded the opportunity of speaking to the Almas Temple Shrine Luncheon Club today—and, before going any further, I bring you the warmest expressions of good will from Kerak Temple in Reno, Nev.

In a world that seems bent on devising means to bring about its own destruction, it is refreshing to participate today among men of good will, who espouse the high principles of peace and understanding.

Only this week I had the pleasure of reading the definition of a Mason and a Shriner—from no less an authority than George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate of the Shrine of North America.

A Mason, he said, is a man who believes in God and practices that belief. A Mason is a man who believes in brotherly love and practices his belief. A Mason is a man who uses the symbols of the builder to set for himself and his brethren a code of life which refines his thoughts, purifies his sympathy, and broadens his outlook, it amplifies his friendship, exalts his morality, and tames his passions.

Mr. Stringfellow described a Shriner as a Mason who realizes the work of his craft—exemplifying the high code of morality—re-

quires refreshment. In obtaining that refreshment, Shriners adopted the code, 59 years ago, of pleasure without intemperance, hospitality without rudeness, and jollity without coarseness.

We live today in a world of tensions. The ever-quickenning tempo of our times would seem to exclude anything but the mad rush for material gains, yet I have detected in frequent trips through our land a spiritual reawakening and a rebirth of tolerance that give ample evidence of a brighter future. Surely the great work of the Shrine in behalf of crippled children—regardless of race, color, or creed—epitomizes to the fullest extent the fact that charity is not a forgotten virtue.

As Americans we must summon all of our collective strength to meet the challenges posed by Soviet Russia and its ill-disguised efforts to gain world domination. But in this life-and-death race for survival, we must not for one instant lose sight of our dependence upon divine providence for spiritual guidance and the constant realization that "man does not live by bread alone."

Unquestionably, these are times that demand the utmost cooperation and effort of all citizens toward making our country stronger in a material sense. Equally important, in my opinion, is the need for even greater effort to utilize more fully our vast resources of the spirit. Only by so doing can we demonstrably prove to all the world that strength really does come from unity.

Although most of you here today are familiar with the event, I am sure you will not mind if I recall the vallant epic of the four chaplains who, with arms linked, perished with their ship in the North Atlantic in World War II, after giving their own life preservers to others.

I read this magnificent story in a book called "Sea of Glory," by Francis Beauchesne Thornton. The four chaplains were George Lansing Fox and Clark V. Poling, Protestant ministers; Father John P. Washington, a Catholic priest, and Alexander D. Goode, a Jewish rabbi.

The chaplains and their unit were en route to Greenland early in 1943—in the terrible days of German submarine supremacy, when the U-boats unmercifully menaced our shipping lanes and made that particular run a thing of danger and terror.

Their ship was a lumbering old freighter, capable of 10 knots at best. Precisely at 1 a.m. of a February morning, the cold Atlantic silence was broken by a shattering

explosion as a German torpedo found its mark amidships. As Mr. Thornton described it: "Everywhere about the ship, in the terror-ridden interior and on the crazily tilted deck, the four chaplains moved among the men with helpful words, giving some the strength to live and some the courage to die."

When pandemonium was at its height, when it became apparent that the ship would soon sink, those chaplains gave their life preservers to other men and made the heroic decision to stay with the ship. As the author states: "Catholic, Jew, and Protestant each proved that night that courage knows no distinction of creed, bravery no division of caste."

Here we see exemplified the highest type of courage and self-sacrifice. There are other kinds of courage, too, and I refer particularly to the courage to live. While we feel that the present age confronts us with problems of almost staggering proportions, we should remember that every generation in our history has had problems—and we have always had men of courage who would rise to the challenge.

Yesterday we observed the 150th anniversary of the birth of such a man. If any person had cause on many occasions to despair and throw in the sponge, it was Abraham Lincoln. His political career was a succession of setbacks. He was defeated for the legislature, he was defeated twice for Congress and twice for the Senate, and he was defeated for nomination as Vice President in 1856. His election to the Presidency in 1860 thrust upon him a burden that was almost insupportable, yet his faith propelled him through the darkest hour in our country's history. Lincoln firmly believed that God had entrusted him with a mission, and in this knowledge he gained the strength that sustained both him and the Nation for which he labored. Lincoln had his watchword. It was stated simply, "With God's help, I shall not fail."

This is a creed all of us could well adopt today, not as a mere utterance but as something to put into practice in our daily lives. As Masons we should strive all the more to translate our precepts into our everyday living—to fight bigotry and intolerance wherever we find it, to inculcate into our youth the importance of fair play, to broaden our horizons beyond our own little circumscribed areas; in short, to give proof that we are alert to our responsibilities as citizens of the greatest country on earth.